DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 062 HE 011 102

AUTHOR Blackburn, Robert T., Ed.
TITLE Studies on Academics and Modes of Inquiry.
INSTITUTION Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 99p.; Papers presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, Spring 1977)
AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Study of Higher Education, School of Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Educational Research; Global Approach; Higher Education; Historical Reviews; Literature Reviews; Questionnaires; Research Design; *Researchers; *Research Methodology; *Scientific Methodology; Social Science Research; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation; *Teacher Role; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Six papers are presented from an American Educational Research Association symposium. The symposium explored the kind of research needed for increasing understanding of college and university faculty and examined the manner in which different scholarly techniques can contribute. The symposium objective was to open for discussion four modes for acquiring knowledge about U.S. academics and to assess the kinds of truth and the degree of truth each can contribute to issues confronting faculty. The papers and contributors are as follows: "Liberalism and the Professoriate," by Wagner Thielens, Jr.,; "Studying the Academic Profession: Comparative Perspectives," by Philip G. Altbach; "Theory and Practice in the Use of Survey Methods: The Case of the Academic Profession," by Gerald M. Platt; "Case Studies of the Academic Profession," by Robert T. Blackburn; "Studying Faculties: The Historian's Contribution," by Walter P. Metzger; and "The Academic Profession: New Directions of Research," by Burton R. Clark. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167062

FEB 2 2 1979

II

STUDIES ON ACADEMICS AND MODES OF INQUIRY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jose L. Michigan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 011 162

Center for the Study of Higher Education
School of Education, The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

April
1978

PUBLICATIONS

Center for the Study of Higher Education
School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

No.			*Price*
1	PROJECTING COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENTS: ANALYZING THE PAST AND FOCUSING THE FUTURE—Wayne L. Mangelsorf, Donald M. Norris, Nick L. Poulton and John A. Seeley	February 1974	$2.50
2	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: ITS LEGAL MANDATE AND ORGANIZATIONAL IMPLICATIONS—Jamie Beth Catlin, John A. Seeley and Margaret Talburtt	March 1974	$3.00
3	AND PLEASANTLY IGNORE MY SEX: ACADEMIC WOMAN, 1974—Dianne S. Peters	July 1974	$2.50
4	AT THE CROSSROADS: A REPORT ON THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE FORTY-EIGHT LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES PREVIOUSLY STUDIES IN *The Golden Years, The Turning Point*—G. Richard Wynn	April 1974	$3.00
5	THE PROPRIETARY SCHOOL: ASSESSING ITS IMPACT ON THE COLLEGIATE SECTOR—J. Michael Erwin	February 1975	$3.00
6	AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION: A CONTINUING FEDERAL DILEMMA (Historical Involvements and Precedents for the Future)—Bette Everett Hamilton and Martin E. Laufer	July 1975	$2.50
7	LIMITED GROWTH IN HIGHER EDUCATION: INDICATORS, IMPACTS, AND IMPLICATIONS—James R. Didham, Alan L. Hull, George C. Newman and Ronald E. Wisner	May 1976	$3.00
8	STRUCTURE AND EMERGENCE: PROCEEDINGS OF AN INSTITUTE ON INNOVATIONS IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION—Zelda F. Gamson and Richard H. Levey	September 1976	$3.00
9	THE UNCOMMON SCHOOL: THE ADULT LEARNER IN THE UNIVERSITY—David Edward Schlaver	August 1977	$3.00
10	RESEARCH ON GOVERNING BOARDS AND SOME PROBLEM SOLVING TACTICS AND STRATEGIES INVOLVING A PROFESSOR AS A TRUSTEE—Robert T. Blackburn	September 1977	$3.00

To order any of the above publications, please write to the address indicated. Checks may be made payable to The University of Michigan.

$3.00

STUDIES ON ACADEMICS AND MODES OF INQUIRY

edited by

Robert T. Blackburn

Center for the Study of Higher Education
School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

April 1978

School of Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Wilbur J. Cohen, Dean

Marvin W. Peterson, Director

Faculty

Robert T. Blackburn
Joseph P. Cosand
Zelda Gamson
Gerald Gurin
Murray Jackson
John D. Lindquist
James L. Miller, Jr.
Karl Zinn

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
LIBERALISM AND THE PROFESSORIAT Wagner Thielens, Jr.	5
STUDYING THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION: COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES Philip G. Altbach	23
THEORY AND PRACTICE IN THE USE OF SURVEY METHODS: THE CASE OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION Gerald M. Platt	37
CASE STUDIES OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION Robert T. Blackburn	57
STUDYING FACULTIES: THE HISTORIAN'S CONTRIBUTION Walter P. Metzger	73
THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION: NEW DIRECTIONS OF RESEARCH Burton R. Clark	91

INTRODUCTION

The papers which constitute this monograph were prepared for and delivered at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New York in Spring, 1977. The occasion was a Symposium (as contrasted to the more typical paper sessions where independent research papers are read). As AERA states, a symposium examines a specific problem "from a variety of perspectives."

Conducting research on faculty from diverse perspectives is important for a number of reasons--for the sake of students and colleges and universities as well as for faculty themselves. Faculty currently confront numerous problems, individually and collectively. Many of the issues can be expected to continue and even to intensify in the future. For example, there is an increased workload from a rising student to faculty ratio; reduced time and financial support for scholarship; and little likelihood of any gain in real income. For new Ph.D.'s, entry at any place and level has become so difficult that one of the nation's highest trained human resources may never be utilized even though society suffers from an abundance of unsolved problems. For recent entrants into the occupation, raised standards for retention and/or advancement along with institutionally imposed tenure quotas combine to produce insecurity and affect job performance. Indeed, even for those supposedly secure in the system, declining enrollments and unpredictable fiscal exigencies have led to layoffs for many who but a few years ago were turning down offers from other colleges and universities in an active marketplace. In this same connection, a healthy faculty mobility pattern in the profession, one which refreshed individuals and revitalized institutions, has been ground to a virtual halt. Faculty are aging in one location now, the few retirements not being replaced. When the bulge of the academics new to the profession since WW II reach 65 and begin to retire in appreciable numbers about a decade from now, leadership vacuum can result from today's failure to induct new recruits. These and other observable and predictable events pose serious threats to academics, individually and collectively--that is, for persons, for the profession, and for institutions. To this set of problems might be added the consequences of affirmative action decisions, a changing student clientele, collective bargaining and its impact on governance, and a host of others.

While research on faculty had increased appreciably in the past decade, until now the principal data gathering techniques have been the survey questionnaire and the small scale empirical investigation. Both methodologies tend to produce findings which have been primarily descriptive. Sometimes the researchers have advanced hypothetical interpretations of their results. Only rarely, however, have their hypotheses been subjected to rigorous testing.

Moreover, there has been but occasional use of other research and scholarly methods for providing insights into academic behavior and for answering questions not readily amenable to the survey approach. Case studies, the comparative approach, and historical inquiry have been utilized much less frequently. The Symposium explored the kind of research needed for increasing understanding of college and university faculty and examined the manner in which different scholarly techniques can contribute. Its objective was to open for discussion four modes for acquiring knowledge about U.S. academics and to assess the kinds of truth and the degree of truth each can contribute to issues confronting faculty.

While such insights have obvious and direct implications for sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, political scientists, historians, and other scholars who study higher education for any of a variety of reasons, the papers should have both interest and applicability for academic administrators as well. Departmental chairpersons, deans, provosts and vice-presidents are in need of current information on faculty. The planning and launching of innovations, designing faculty evaluation procedures, enriching faculty development programs--to mention but three topical matters--require a sound understanding of academic values and behaviors, insights which these principally methodological papers also provide. Professors, a breed not uncurious about themselves, should also find the papers of interest.

The charge to each contributor was both specific and flexible. The problem was stated as it appears above, and the methodological perspective naturally was specified. Beyond that, however, the freedom one gives a leading scholar in a field naturally was extended on this occasion as well. Neither formats nor emphasis were suggested. Each expert simply was asked to focus on what he thought was most important for understanding academics from his particular methodological approach at this point in time.

Wagner Thielens, Jr., Associate Director, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, was asked to provide a background of the literature since his foundation work with Paul Lazarsfeld two decades ago. What Thielens uncovered was a theme

of "liberalism-conservatism" running through the studies up to and including the current ones, a variable which accounts for a significant portion of our understanding of academic people. This theme guides his literature review.

Philip Altbach, Professor of Higher Education, SUNY-Buffalo, and I responded quite similarly to the charge. We each did a survey of the literature--he from the comparative and international perspective and I from the point of view of case studies--and discussed what we believe to be the virtues and limitations of the respective methods. While different in content and concern, Altbach's and mine are alike in form.

As different as they are in substance, Jerry Platt, Professor of Sociology, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, and Walter Metzger, Professor of History, Columbia University responded to the charge in a similar fashion. Their papers highlight a methodological focus more than provide a literature search. Each is critical of what has been the "standard" methodology of his discipline. Metzger calls attention to the more recent quantitative historical analysis. Platt is deeply concerned with the validity of findings which survey analysts announce.

Burton Clark, Professor of Sociology, Yale University, was the respondent to the symposium papers. In this role his was an impromptu performance (and embarrassingly truncated by the disappearance of time at the close of the session). Clark kindly has since put down on paper what he interprets to be the importance and significance of the symposium papers. His is the concluding paper.

I am indebted to each of the contributors for having taken the time to prepare these papers in response to an invitation of mine and to appear at a meeting for their delivery. Furthermore, they have permitted me to edit their papers and have gracefully accepted suggestions for inclusion and/or deletion.* (Each has approved the final version appearing here.) On all accounts, I thank them.

Robert T. Blackburn
Professor of Higher Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan

Ann Arbor
February, 1978

---

* Some overlap inevitably occurs when the charges to the authors were as open as they were on this occasion. A little duplication remains even after editing for in some instances the harm of repetition was judged to be less than the disruption of the text.

Last, space and cost considerations led to slight contractions in the papers, the exception being Wagner Thielens where amputations resulted. He will share his extended original version with an interested reader.

LIBERALISM AND THE PROFESSORIAT

by

Wagner Thielens, Jr.

In the 1977 AERA program, the title listed for this paper was "An overview of the research on academics since The Academic Mind." A full-dress review of that literature is not possible here. A rough estimate indicates that, in the two decades since The Academic Mind was written, upwards of 100 books have been published which deal either completely or in major part with research on American college and university professors. With them came perhaps another 100 unpublished full-length reports and monographs, about 1,000 or 1,200 published articles, and a like number of unpublished articles. Several segments of this huge bulk have received review treatment, especially parts of the research on professors' teaching.[1] But even with the help of such digests, a thorough accounting of the literature would not be feasible in these pages.

Clearly the space available permits only a more limited approach. But of the several kinds of partial accounting we might attempt, which should we pursue? It would be possible to sort out and describe some major substantive clusters, some groupings into which research on the professoriat tends to fall. Or alternatively, we could consider some striking commonalities, some major themes and repeated concerns, which appear and reappear in this literature. Or taking still a third tack, we could explore the twenty years of work for its analytic underpinnings--for its theoretic continuities and developments.[2] The original version of this paper, as written for the AERA session, devoted a brief paragraph to each of these three, to suggest how they might each take shape.

I have chosen here, instead, to sketch what might be called a "permeation analysis" of one part of the literature. I will try to show how helpful and far-reaching a single characteristic of the academic can be for penetrating and understanding two decades of research on academics. We shall see, indeed, that this trait can tell us a great deal about the academic man--about his research and scholarship, his teaching, his approach to colleagues and school, his sense of place in the world. This crucial characteristic is liberalism.

When Paul Lazarsfeld and I (as a very junior colleague) were trying in the 1950's to make sense of the roomful of interview transcripts recorded for The Academic Mind,[3] we found that a variable we called "permissiveness," an integral part of what I here term "liberalism," proved more useful than any other to organize our data on 2,451 social science professors in the McCarthy era. Twenty years later, when Ladd and Lipset explored a broad range of questions and issues about academics and academia in a nation-wide survey, and reported the results in a lengthy series of Chronicle of Higher Education reports, they too repeatedly found professors' liberalism a variable integral to the matters they considered. Liberalism was as important for understanding academics in 1975 as it had been in 1955. Too, all of the key findings which held true in 1955 continued to hold true in 1975. There is evidence, though considerably less systematic, that the same relationships have held true for a century or more.[4]

These observations clearly suggest that professors' liberalism deserves our close attention as a force which may well have permanent and basic importance in structuring professors' thoughts and actions. In the following pages, an introductory review of the available findings will provide considerable support for this notion. My aim is to set forth a review of a literature which delineates the impressive substantive reach into that literature of a particular professional characteristic. To highlight the extent of this reach, the presentation of findings is deliberately oversimplified, omitting particulars of their sample scope, replication status, etc. A more exacting scholarly analysis, of course, would note and weigh these considerations. In the same spirit, the text provides extensive but not comprehensive referencing. And while examples are numerous, they by no means exhaust the available supply.[5]

Professorial liberalism is conceived more broadly here than is ordinarily the case in research studies, even though most research formulations have not been exceedingly specialized or narrow. Our measure in The Academic Mind, for instance, brought together five rather diverse indicators to show that a professor we labelled "permissive" was willing to give Communists, Socialists, "radicals" and other politically far-left-of-center ideologues a hearing or a presence on the campus. (AcM:Ch.5). The permissive professor was one who felt that an admitted Communist teaching on the campus should not be fired, that students should be allowed if they chose to invite a controversial figure of the day to speak on campus, and so on. The underlying left-libertarian stance such views illustrated was a prime target for the McCarthyite charges of the time whose impact we had been asked to study, and so was clearly appropriate for our purposes. But the teachers we classified as permissive were also very prone to favor the admission

of Red China to the United Nations, to read current left-of-center magazines like the Reporter and the New Republic, to criticize local industries for restrictive labor practices, to label themselves Democrats and not Republicans, and to tell us that they believed they were "more liberal on political matters" than most people in the community where their school was located. In all of these ways, these men and women expressed a broadly-inclusive liberal perspective, whose scope ranged considerably beyond our give-the-far-left-a-campus-airing measure.

In 1975, twenty years later, Ladd and Lipset's survey of the professoriat produced evidence for a similar conclusion. The men and women classified as "liberal" or "very liberal" ordinarily called themselves "left" or "liberal;" they were very likely to believe that school busing was a good way to achieve racial integration, and to favor the legalization of marijuana. In addition, they were very prone to express strong approval for detente with Russia and equally strong disapproval of an increase in the federal defense budget, to believe that Watergate revealed basic weaknesses in American institutions, to object to the notion that citizen motivation towards competition lies at the core of societal progress, to feel that "most American colleges are racist whether they mean to be or not," and in a predictable continuity with 1955, to call themselves Democrats (Chr:11/10/75, 11/24/75, 3/29/76, 4/26/76). Again, the research results had revealed a liberal stance which was, in its overall contours, widely encompassing. In twenty years, the world had changed, its problems and issues were different, but the liberal perspective in addressing them was much the same: interested in new solutions, critical of the stand-pat and the status quo, sympathetic to the deprived and the downtrodden, and unadmiring towards the rich and the powerful.

A conservative perspective, in 1955, was again broadly inclusive, as reflected by opposition to radicalism and nonconformity on campus, by opposition to Red China, by boosterism for local business, and by reading Time. In 1975, the campus conservatives disapproved of busing and marijuana, supported the Pentagon, and so on. At both points, very frequently, the conservatives were staunch Republicans.

In these studies, and in others as well,[6] the number of measured variables bound together by a network of strong empirical correlations proves to be large. Equally important, the variables the correlations interlink share clear substantive kinship; they have in common a recognizable and familiar liberal ring. As a result, to regard liberalism in the encompassing terms we use here seems sound. And conservatism, both empirically and substantively, represents the opposite reaches of an inclusive polarity.

Distribution

To understand the numerous significant correlaries of the individual professor's liberal or conservative standpoint, we must take cognizance of three important distributional properties of academic liberalism.

First, there are large differences, nationwide, between academic disciplines. Overall, the social scientists are the most liberal, followed by the humanities, and by the law faculty. Nearing the composite average lies the school of fine arts. Slightly to the conservative side of academe are the physical and biological sciences, the faculty of the medical schools, and the professors of education. Distinctly more conservative than the rest, finally, there are the faculties of business, engineering, agriculture, and other applied fields. The differences are very considerable indeed. In 1968, for instance, 75 percent of the American social science faculty voted for Hubert Humphrey in the Presidential election, as contrasted with 37 percent of the engineering faculty (DivA:62, et passim).

Second, the most liberal sector of the professoriat tends to be concentrated strongly in the most prestigious institutions, those which possess the finest resources for research and scholarship. In our 1955 study of social science faculties, we found (AcM:162) that at schools whose large library, high proportion of Ph.D.'s on the faculty, and bountiful budget-dollars-per-student put them in the best-endowed quartile nationwide, 58 percent of the faculty belonged in our most liberal classification. At schools whose resources located them in the lowest quarter, by contrast, just 22 percent fell into the same liberal classification. Ladd and Lipset (DivA:143) found that in 1969, the pattern held generally for all of academia's disciplinary branches.[7] It is true that there are more markedly liberal professors in the social science departments at institutions having the best scholarship resources than in the business schools on those campuses, but there are far fewer still in the business faculties of the least-endowed institutions.

The third, and equally fundamental, distributional fact concerns the national stance of the professoriat. Taken as a whole, academics are more liberal by a substantial margin than the American public. Shortly before the data for The Academic Mind were collected in 1955, a study by Stouffer showed that 68 percent of the adult American population believed that "a clerk in a store who is an admitted Communist should be fired;" just nine percent of the social science professoriat agreed (AcM:431). In the 1968 election, Humphrey in fact lost the election nationally to Nixon by a scant seven-tenths of one percent; if academia alone had cast the votes, Humphrey would have won by a recordbreaking 22 percent (DivA:62).

Demographics

Bearing these distributional fundamentals in mind, we can now turn to the research findings on the various attributes and behaviors associated with professorial liberalism and conservatism. First, some demographic linkages: Nationwide, Jewish academics are the most liberal; blacks come next, and white Protestants and Catholics both trail behind (DivA:178). In each of these major segments, however, liberals are markedly less devout than conservatives: liberal Jews are much less religiously inclined than conservative Jews, liberal Catholics than conservative Catholics, and so on.[8] To the extent that religiosity reflects a kind of traditional rootedness in the community, the liberal professor is distinctly less integrated in his world than the conservative is.

Men and women, at least in the generalized terms we are considering are identical in their liberalism patterns (DivA:179). (On matters concerning the women's movement, this does not always remain quite true: Chr: 5/10/76.) Liberal academics, in contrast with the pattern for the general public, tend overall to come from a more affluent and occupationally prestigious background than do conservatives. But once the liberals' concentration in particular disciplines and on campuses having the best scholarship facilities is taken into consideration, no differences between liberals and conservatives remain (DivA:174). Family origins, so important to understanding the social and political stance of other Americans, do not matter at all in this regard to the professoriat. In a second sense of importance, academia stands again disengaged from roots in the larger society.

A demographic characteristic which matters greatly for professors, as for all Americans, is age. Young academics tend to be most liberal, older academics most conservative (AcM:145; DivA:188). As people age, inside the academy or out, they typically grow far more conservative. A faculty today unable to take in new young members is thus not only older but more conservative than it was in the past, and particularly than it was in the rapid expansion in the 1960's, with its flood of young newcomers. Academics often complain of late about the intellectual loss to higher education from its inability to take in a new cohort of Ph.D.'s; they may not recognize as clearly that they also describe the loss of a contingent of liberals.

I would speculate that the relationship between age and liberalism may have more permanent and in-built ramifications. Typically, when a candidate comes up for tenure, the professors who sit on the committee are older than the candidate. Presumably, we should now add, they are also more conservative than he. Does

this difference, which involves a clear disparity in perspective between candidate and committee, systematically affect the result? More generally, how does the academic's normal human movement from liberalism to conservatism as he ages affect his teaching, his research, and the rest of his work? These questions need close study.

Awareness and Activism

Liberals are more alert to potential problems than conservatives, and more likely to attempt to do something, individually or collectively, about the problems they discern. In the 1950's, liberal social scientists were far more likely than their conservative colleagues to follow news of civil liberties issues and developments on the national scene. Among professors on a campus who had not personally been subject to McCarthyite complaints or charges, the liberals were more cognizant of instances in which other professors had been the target of a complaint than were their conservative counterparts on the same faculty. If a dean or president of a school took a stand which a liberal professor disapproved, the professor was prone to register a protest; when his conservative colleague was similarly offended, he less often spoke up (AcM:143, 258).

In this dimension, again, professors as a group differ from the public at large. In the 1975 Ladd-Lipset Chronicle data, 45 percent of the nation's academics recorded their active participation in some kind of public policy forum, as compared with approximately eight percent of the public at large, and with 19 percent of those having an education comparable to the academic's. (Chr:12/22/75 also analyzes locus of participation.)

Altogether, such findings suggest, liberals on the campus are necessarily aware of their differences with the nation and the public (AcM:133), and are attuned to the diverse consequences of their position as a minority. Conservatives, regularly in harmonious accord with the larger community, lack such environing spurs to self-awareness. The liberal academic also translates his beliefs into activity more often than the conservative does (Chr: 12/22/75). During the Viet Nam war, the liberals on campus were more vocal, more likely to form protest groups, and to put ads in the New York Times. But campus-wide polls showed repeatedly that they were less representative of their faculties than the visible signs might suggest. As Mr. Nixon could have put it, on the campus there were also a conservative silent minority.

The fact that the professoriat is well to the left of the public, when put together with the activist impulses of the liberals

on the faculty, has a number of implications. In the local community where the professor makes his home, liberal views are characteristically also unorthodox views. The more widely liberal a faculty as a whole, the greater the overall disparity of viewpoint between town and gown on such issues as the fluoridation of the local water supply, the right of community policemen and firemen to form unions, the propriety of smokestacks which pour soot into the air, and so on. The potential for discord is as permanent as the campus' presence.

Furthermore, the liberal's activism can convert latent disparities into repeated episodes of open controversy. His vocal attendance at meetings, his letters to the local editor, his petitions for an underdog cause, all make him a highly noticeable presence and a target for conservative ire. The president of his institution or the dean of his college will repeatedly be required to cope with community complaints about his "loud mouth" and "wild ideas" and "interference." Because of the ideological disagreements between faculty and community, and between professoriat and nation, buffer devices will characteristically develop to forestall excessive friction. In the 1950's, often, an experienced administration or an aroused faculty acted to prevent serious damage to the liberal professors who came under McCarthyite attack (AcM:159-180). As activists, of course, liberals frequently sound their own best alarms. They can help considerably to soften the impact of developing crises by stirring their campuses to vigilance and to preventive measures. On the other hand, since their involvement is not always energized by special disciplinary expertise, liberals sometimes slip damagingly into empty sloganizing.

A professoriat poised ready and arousable at the left of the nation's center continues characteristic of our world today. The problems this situation intrinsically poses, both for academia and for the larger society, remain largely unstudied.

Colleagues and Institution

Liberals view their colleagues, their department, and their institution quite differently than do their conservative counterparts. As noted earlier, the liberals on a campus were more often aware than conservatives that a local professor had come under McCarthyite attack. They were, doubtless, considerably more likely to regard their disciplinary colleagues around the country as their reference group, as the group whose good opinion they most valued and whose standards they most readily accepted. Conservative professors, in contrast, were more closely attuned to the views of their superiors in the college administration, and more inclined

to give priority to the interests of their institutions (AcM:141-142). Presently there are parallel disagreements over a comparable matter. On campuses where the formation of a faculty union is either a current issue or a recent event, liberals are much more pro-union than conservatives (Chr:2/2/76, 2/9/76). Far more than do conservatives, today as before, liberals see the professor and his work as deserving special safeguards.

Among contemporaries, liberals have much the same rank in their department as do conservatives. But they see its workings, nevertheless, quite differently. Department chairmen, we found in the 1950's, were likely to be older professors. On the whole, it follows, they were more conservative. But among age peers, liberals held the department chairmanship as often as conservatives. A very similar pattern proved true for school committees: conservatives held more committee posts; but only because they were older. Notwithstanding, liberals were less likely overall to hold these important administrative positions than conservatives (AcM:152,442-3).

Perhaps again only because of their youth, liberals dislike administrative tasks more than conservatives. They also dislike established hierarchy: they more often favor rotation of the department chairmanship, and as the English study by Halsey and Trow put it, they object more strongly to a "professorial oligarchy."[9]

On matters of hiring and promotion, the liberals' viewpoint continues to differ from the conservatives'. True, both pay tribute to the importance of fine teaching as a criterion for advancement. But liberals, more than conservatives, believe research and scholarship should also be important (Chr:3/29/76).

Liberals have quite different ideas about who should be hired. In the spring of 1975, with retrenchment in full swing, Ladd and Lipset found that liberals remained "vastly" more likely to favor egalitarian standards than conservatives. Liberals, that is, believe that women, blacks, and other groups now under-represented on the faculty should have special preference. Conservatives, in contrast, strongly favor meritocratic standards. To them, hiring and promotion should be based strictly on academic qualifications. Faculty disagreement on this issue, indeed, is great. In the most liberal one-fifth of the professoriat, 71 percent take an egalitarian stand, as compared to 21 percent of the most conservative one-fifth (Chr:3/8/76). In future research on this sensitive and provocative matter, I believe, the academic's liberal or conservative perspective should routinely be recorded.

More than the conservative, the liberal wants to move on, and expects to. He more often feels that his present institution is not really a good place for him, and even in the current employment crunch, he expects before long to seek a job on a more appealing campus (Chr:2/2/76). In this, the liberal is more a "cosmopolitan" than a "local."[10] Restless, critical, he hopes for a better life in a different place. He sees his own situation as he sees the cosmos: a change can be made for the better, and should. Notwithstanding, the liberal is more satisfied with a professional career, overall, than the conservative is (DivA:83).

We know considerably more, to date, about liberalism and conservatism as a property of the individual professor than about their nature as a social climate, as a property of a department or a campus. The Academic Mind offered beginning evidence that differences in the patterning of liberalism among the social scientists on a campus do matter in the lives of individual professors. At institutions where the faculty was either largely liberal or largely conservative, individual professors were typically more content with their relationships to each other than on campuses with a mix of liberals and conservatives (AcM:147). This might of course not remain true in less conflicted times. Again, we found that the characteristic career movement of the professor from a liberal to a conservative perspective was considerably attenuated among primarily liberal faculties, and augmented on more conservative campuses (AcM:249). But as best I can determine, these early leads have not been pursued in more recent studies.

Students and Teaching

Liberals and conservatives disagree about the kinds of students a school should admit. As with faculty hiring and promotion, the liberals want to make special room on campus for minorities and for the underprivileged. Conservatives would select students, like faculty, on ability alone (Chr:3/8/76).

The nature of formal education is also contested. Concerning undergraduate education, the liberal often begins with the premise that students should take active part in a school's decisions about the curriculum, and in a professor's decisions about course content (DivA:212). A quarter of today's liberals would even grant students a voting voice in their school's policy on the hiring and promoting of faculty members (Chr:3/22/76). To the conservative, the undergraduate is not a qualified consultant on these matters. Two-thirds of the most liberal social scientists in the 1950's thought it more important to get undergraduates to think about the problem areas in a subject than to give them a basic

grounding of facts; three-quarters of the conservatives disagreed. Similarly, the liberals more strongly favored the frequent discussion of controversial ideas and the airing of differences of opinion in the classroom, and more often believed it their task to prepare undergraduates to make a contribution to the improvement of society. More than conservatives, they felt that once students receive rounded discussion of subjects which question traditional values, the instructor should also argue his own view (AcM:134-140). The liberals, thus, considered the classroom an appropriate arena for the propagation of their cause. The conservatives, no doubt, also ended up transmitting their stance to students, but less deliberately and more tacitly, and with less sense that it was indeed a cause.

Although I have seen no data on the point, I would guess that liberals object to the lecture as a teaching format. They would surely say it leaves the student too passive a part in the learning process. Similarly, I would assume that it is primarily the liberals who try innovative teaching methods, who dislike grading on the curve, and so on.

Outside the classroom, the evidence yet again records sharp differences. Liberal academics, activists themselves, are far more sympathetic to students' activism (DivA:212). As noted earlier, they are considerably more tolerant to the use of marijuana, presumably on campus as well as off. By a 50 percent margin, they more often accord to students a major role in matters of student discipline (Chr:3/22/76). These diverse bits of information clearly suggest a broad disagreement between liberal and conservative as to what is suitable and appropriate in the undergraduate's extracurricular life.

Research and Scholarship

Liberals are noticeably more involved in research and scholarly writing than conservatives, but the difference is less dramatic than many of those described earlier in this paper. In the 1950's, social science professors at the liberal end of the spectrum were approximately 20 percent more likely at each successive stage of their career to have produced books or articles, or both, than those at the conservative end (AcM:146). The 1969 Carnegie survey found a closely similar pattern to hold true for professors, nationwide and in all disciplines (DivA:216). Not surprisingly, liberals are more research-oriented than conservatives, more likely to appear among the minority of academics who admit to preferring research over teaching, more likely to feel that teaching obligations interfere with their research, and so on (Chr:3/29/76). Since liberals far outnumber conservatives to

begin with, these findings indicate that a great preponderance of the scholarly writing and research carried out on American campuses is produced by liberals.

So it becomes particularly important to recognize that clear differences also exist in research styles. Conservatives concentrate on rigor. Their watchwords are "precision," "careful experimentation," "testing," and "previously-formulated hypotheses." Liberals also believe in sound research, but they are more interested than conservatives in exploration and innovation. For instance, they feel much more disposed to entertain speculative theories which are not as yet grounded in hard data. They are more attracted to "new and wild ideas," more open to intuition, more prepared to accept that subjective involvement and personal bias are inherent parts of the scholar's existence (Chr:3/8/76, 3/29/76). I would guess, too, that liberals not only approach research differently than do conservatives, but that they are interested in different kinds of topics. In research on academics, for example, I would speculate that liberals tend often to study innovative teaching methods and teachers' politics, while conservatives gravitate more to a focus on working conditions and career patterns.

The marked linkage between professors' liberal beliefs and research activities has often been explained as the natural result of our society's rapid change. As a characteristic treatment, The Academic Mind describes the emergence in recent centuries of a new class of learned men, with the professoriat as a part, whose function is to deal with societal change--to increase knowledge rather than to preserve it, to alter custom rather than to stabilize it, to question authority rather than support it. A liberal professoriat, or its equivalent in some other part of the social fabric, is needed "to help society adjust to novel conditions while discarding outmoded patterns (AcM:151)." A bit ruefully, I should now add, there is a tone here of suitably modest self-congratulation, of patent truth well recorded which bespeaks the liberal persuasions of its authors. Few liberal academicians, after all, are opposed to the belief that they themselves represent the leading edge of an evolving society. Conservative professors, I need hardly say, portray their liberal colleagues in a far less flattering light (e.g., AcM:119-124).

Some Limitations of Research by Liberals on Academics

I want to close with a few comments, all speculative, none based on hard findings, on the problematics of liberal research on the professoriat. A pronounced characteristic of the literature I have surveyed is the devotion of considerably more attention to the liberal professor and his institution, than to the

conservative professor and his. I have reproduced this asymmetry here. So it seems only fair, when I turn to some problem areas in this literature, to concentrate on research by liberal professors. Liberals, it is true, are more likely than conservatives to recognize the principle that the researcher's own limitations inevitably affect his work. But they are not invariably skilled at applying this general theorem to their particular work. In truth, research by liberals can display the limitations of the liberal viewpoint in a rich variety of ways.

One such parochialism, all too common in large-scale studies, is the tacit assumption that the liberal's own standards of what is good or bad, desirable or undesirable, apply to the entire educational arena with which he deals. The Academic Mind, a study I confess to consider the match of many in its generally cosmopolitan view and its methodologic sophistication, makes repeated use of an important classification to describe the 165 colleges in the study. We found that a measure combining information about the size of the school's library, the proportion of its faculty who have Ph.D.'s, the size of its budget as compared to its student population, and the number of its undergraduates who move on to advanced schooling, was of tremendous value for organizing and making sense of our data (AcM:Ch.7). The summary power of this measure cannot be criticized. But to describe it, as we did, as recording the school's "quality" is to extend to all of academia a standard propounded mainly by liberal researchers, and accurately descriptive principally of the large-university world in which Lazarsfeld and Thielens worked. Our measure, to be sure, provides an excellent rough indication of the quality of a university's (or prestigious four-year college's) research facilities and scholarly ambience. But there are many institutions in other academic leagues which do not and should not measure their quality by the size of their library, but by their ability to place their students in the middle reaches of the local occupational structure, or their success at teaching conservative community values, or other appropriate standards. Higher education is diverse in its goals, not uniform, and the only true measure of a particular institution's quality is the degree of its success in reaching its own goals.

A related limitation is displayed in the literature on the classroom. In the hundreds of studies which examine students' gains from professors' courses, the vast majority focus upon changes in student traits which liberal professors hope to bring about--decreases in authoritarianism and dogmatism, increases in autonomy and libertarianism, for example.[11] I believe these studies clearly reflect the liberal's hope that his classes can help students to wrestle creatively with the problems of society and to cope effectively with controversy and change. Only a

very few studies, less than a dozen, look at the success of the conservative's effort to increase students' knowledge and to give them a basic grounding in the relevant facts about a subject area.[12] This means that what we know from research about the educational accomplishments of our system of colleges and universities is limited, by and large, to its success or failure in achieving liberal professors' goals for their students.

Liberals' research is sometimes so dogmatic in impetus and narrow in execution as to prevent the researcher from demonstrating what he intends. This self-defeating short-circuitry is most vividly illustrated in the by-now huge literature on innovative teaching methods. One can find in this literature (reviewed in, e.g., Dubin & Taveggia, op.cit.; Dubin & Hedley, op. cit.; McKeachie, op. cits.) more than a hundred studies which repetitively follow a characteristic outline. The article or report begins by expressing the researcher's conviction that lecturing is an unsuitable and obsolete method for teaching; the author convincingly argues its patent weaknesses. Rather, he continues, it is clear that students can learn more from a discussion classroom format. They participate more actively, they are stimulated to apply the topic to their own lives. The author, without reviewing the available literature, and apparently not realizing that one exists, describes his decision to teach a course in two sections, one using the lecture method and the other using the discussion method, and records his confidence that the identical final examinations should demonstrate the superior virtues of discussion. Here the tone of the report changes. The outcome has been disappointing, for the two groups of students have written interchangeable sets of exams. The paper ends with the researcher's concession that his comparison of examinations was an inadequate test, and with an affirmation of his belief that a more careful record of student gains between the beginning of the course and its end, or a more sensitive measurement of some other kind, would have demonstrated the true superiority of the discussion class. (Unfortunately, though, we would have to inform him that all such refined measures, so far, still show the two end results to be pretty much interchangeable.) If this professor had done his homework, he would have discovered what his conservative colleagues call a basic grounding of relevant facts: that several dozen other American educators who had each followed his own short history of innovative effort had achieved much the same stalemate as he. He would also find, characteristically enough, that those conservatives have not themselves carried out research to find out if the traditional lecture might indeed have special virtues.

Unhappily, I believe that liberals continue to search for the gold at the end of some new innovative teaching rainbow, and that the conservatives continue uninterested in improving their

teaching. As a result, the many potentially fruitful lessons of our long history of failed teaching innovations remain all but totally unexamined.

May I end, then, with an expression of hope that the liberal researcher, in his studies of the professoriat, will pause briefly to look more closely at his own position on the liberal-conservative spectrum, and to consider the blinkered view this position may just possibly impose on his work. If he should, and if it does, his research assuredly could benefit.[13]

FOOTNOTES

1. Examples include F. Costin, W.T. Greenough, and R.J. Menges, "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness." Review of Educational Research, 1971: 41, 511-535; Dubin, Robert and Thomas C. Taveggia, The Teaching-Learning Paradox: A Comparative Analysis of College Teaching. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1968; Dubin, Robert and R. Alan Hedley, The Medium May Be Related to the Message. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969; Feldman, Kenneth A., "Grades and College Students' Evaluations of Their Courses and Teachers." Research in Higher Education, 1976a: 4, 69-111; Feldman, Kenneth A., "The Superior College Teacher From the Student's View." Research in Higher Education, 1976b: 5, 243-288; McKeachie, W.J., "Research on Teaching at the College and University Level." In N.L. Gage, ed., Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965: 1118-1172; McKeachie, W.J., "Research on College Teaching: A Review." Report #6, Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970.

2. Available on request from the author, 440 East 87th Street, New York, New York 10028. This is a revised and abbreviated version of a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meetings in April, 1977, under the title "Research on the Professoriat: 1957 to 1977."

3. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.

4. See, e.g., Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset. The Divided Academy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, pp. 14-21. Also, see their series of reports in the Chronicle of Higher Education beginning with the issue of September 15, 1975.

5. The Academic Mind, I hope not inappropriately, is well represented here, as are the thirty-seven 1975-76 Chronicle articles. The paper also draws extensively on the various reports based on the giant nationwide 1969 survey of 60,000 full-time professors, drawn from all reaches of American higher education, which was carried out for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The major Carnegie source used is Ladd and Lipset's The Divided Academy (1975); Trow, Martin (editor), Teachers and Students. New York: McGraw-

Hill, 1975; Steinberg, Stephen, The Academic Melting Pot. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974; and other Carnegie volumes also contribute. Halsey and Trow's study of The British Academics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971, though mentioned explicitly here only at one point, demonstrates that a number of the principal American findings also hold true for contemporary Great Britain.

For brevity, references to three cited works are specially abbreviated. A reference to page 232 in The Academic Mind appears as "AcM:232," to page 323 in The Divided Academy as "DivA:323," and to a Ladd and Lipset article in the December 3, 1975 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education as "Chr:12/3/75."

6. Ladd, Everett C., Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset, op.cit.; Halsey, A.H., and Martin Trow, op. cit.; Noll, C. Edward and Peter H. Rossi, General Social and Economic Attitudes of College and University Faculty Members. University of Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966.

7. See also Noll, C. Edward and Peter H. Rossi, op. cit., p. 21.

8. Steinberg, Stephen, op. cit., p. 60.

9. Halsey, A.H. and Martin Trow, op. cit., Table 15.48, p. 440.

10. Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals - I," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1957: 2, 281-306. "II," ASQ, 1957: 2, 444-480.

11. Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969, Ch. 2.

12. Bloom, Benjamin S. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964: 82-83; Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb, op. cit.

13. Other works cited in the original, longer paper and which influenced the remarks made here are, alphabetically: Jacques Barzun, The American University. New York: Harper Colophon, 1968; Joseph Ben-David, American Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972; Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; Benjamin S. Bloom, "Thought Processes in Lectures and Discussions." Journal of General Education, 1953: 7, 160-169; Burton Clark, "Faculty Culture." Pp. 39-54 in Terry F. Lunsford, ed., The Study of Campus Cultures.

Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963; Greeley, Andrew M. From Backwater to Mainstream: A Profile of Catholic Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969; Pace, C. Robert, Education and Evangelism: A Profile of Protestant Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

STUDYING THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION: COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

by

Philip G. Altbach

The study of the academic profession is a new area of research for educators and for social scientists. It has long been assumed that universities were institutions graced by some higher intellectual powers and which were beyond the purview of social science research. Investigation of the affairs of academe was considered somehow undignified. There was also, no doubt, an element of self-protection and a desire to limit dissemination of knowledge about how universities work to a wider public. With recent crises in higher education and with a growing academic interest in universities, research on higher education in general and on the academic profession in particular has expanded substantially. There has been interest in the internal operation of universities and in the role of higher education in society in large part because universities have assumed unprecedented importance as social institutions. Without question, the United States has seen the largest amount of research and writing about higher education in general and about the academic profession in particular and many foreign scholars look to American research as a starting point for their own work. Americans, on the other hand, seldom take into account insights offered by analysts from other countries and do not generally consider relevant comparative examples. It is my conviction that a comparative perspective can help to shed light on the American experience and will contribute a breadth of perception to analyses of individual countries that purely national analysis cannot provide. This paper will focus on trends in the literature concerning the professoriate which has appeared in other countries. It will also comment on some of the problems and possibilities of comparative research on the academic profession. As there has been little crossnational discussion of this topic, and bibliographic sources are incomplete, this paper is a first effort rather than a polished analysis.

Because of the newness of the field of studies of the academic profession, analysts generally take their paradigms from broader studies of higher education and their methodologies

from the social sciences. There are no "standard" works on the academic profession to which most analysts refer in their own work. This is particularly the case with the literature from other countries, where national studies are generally very limited. In the United States the pioneering work of Lazarsfeld and Thielens[1] and Caplow and McGee[2] are widely cited, and recently the analyses stemming from the Carnegie Commission surveys of American faculty have become well known.[3] Many scholars have included academics as part of their studies of higher education, but for the most part the academic profession has been a part of more general analyses rather than the main focus.[4] Relatively few analysts of the "university crisis" and the student revolts of the 1960's devoted much attention to the role and reactions of the professoriate.[5] The point of these remarks is to indicate that there is no real tradition of studies of the professoriate with an established literature or with accepted methodological procedures. Even in the United States, the field is only now emerging. In other countries, it is virtually absent, although some research work is of high quality and should be included in the emergence of a subfield of studies of the academic profession.

The general literature on the academic profession, in the United States as well as abroad, seems to consider academics as an element of the university context or as an example of some element of the social sciences. Some analysts have looked at academics as part of a complex organization studies, while others have examined professionalism by looking at the academic profession. Robert Merton and others have looked at academics as professional groups.[6] Similarly, economists have looked at the economics of the academic profession, political scientists at the political aspects, etc.[7] Even scholars of higher education have in general looked at aspects of the profession rather than its total context. Such issues as collective bargaining, tenure, and others which are of immediate concern to administrators and policy makers have received attention, while few have attempted to undertake research and analysis of the academic profession in a broader context.

The nature of this research and analysis has both strengths and weaknesses. On the one hand, there is by now, at least in the United States, a quite useful data base, some of which has been provided by very able social scientists. The amount of literature available for most foreign countries remains so small that even this data base remains inadequate. On the other hand, scholars for the most part have been looking at limited elements of a large and complex phenomenon and in at least some cases are unable to fit their studies into the broader framework of the profession. Researchers, as they undertake work on aspects of the

academic profession, should be aware of both the strengths and weaknesses of their approaches and of the currently available literature.

It is very difficult to characterize the literature on higher education from other nations. It is, however, fair to state that there is virtually no truly comparative or cross-cultural studies currently available.[8] There are some good reasons for this lack of comparative research which will be discussed later in this paper, but it is important to keep in mind that comparative, in this context, really means studies of individual nations or institutions outside of the United States.[9] The bulk of the literature is also not very large. A bibliography containing about 1,700 listings concerning higher education outside of the United States covering materials published in 1974 contains only 54 listings on the professoriate, indicating that the research has not as yet been overwhelmingly substantial.[10]

Scholars of higher education have long recognized the key role of the professoriate in determining the development of the university. Studies of the medieval university, especially of the "Paris model" stress the role of the faculty.[11] Fritz Ringer's analysis of the development of the modern German university also stresses the role of the faculty.[12] Some attention has also been given, from the historical perspective, to the role of the academic profession in Oxford University and the history of British higher education has stressed the professoriate.[13] But given the rather large literature on the history of higher education in Europe, there is relatively little specific work available on the development of the academic profession in the historical perspective. The professoriate is treated in most historical studies, but generally in the context of other elements of the university. Even Lawrence Stone's excellent edited volumes on the history of the university in Europe and America feature only three out of thirteen chapters devoted to the professoriate, while five deal with students.[14] There is very little consideration of the academic profession from the historical perspective in the Third World nations. Two excellent articles on India do exist and some attention has been given to the role of faculty in Latin American university history.[15]

The social sciences have produced a larger body of research and analysis concerning the academic profession. The past decade has seen a particularly impressive growth in the literature. The following notes reflect only a small part of the literature, with major stress on readily available materials in English. The bulk of the social science literature concerns the attitudes of academics and their roles in universities. Very few studies concern the broader political role of the academic profession. Sociologists

and to some extent political scientists as well as some educationists have done research on this topic. Economists, psychologists, and others have taken less interest in professorial politics. The large bulk of the available literature concerns the industrialized nations, with West Germany, Japan, and Britain receiving most attention. Relatively little research has been done about the Third World.

The Germans, in part because their university system has been dominated by the professoriate and because of a strong tradition of social science research and partly because of the recent crises in German higher education, have devoted considerable attention to the academic profession. One of the major reform trends in West Germany has been to limit or abolish the traditional domination of the "full professor" by instituting new patterns of university organization and by enfranchizing junior faculty, students, and in some cases nonprofessional employees. These changes have dramatically changed those universities where they have been instituted (because West Germany is a federal system, some states have not reformed their universities) and have been the subject of major controversy and of litigation in the courts.[16] Current research in West Germany will no doubt provide new and valuable insights on the changing status of the German academic profession.

Japanese higher education has also undergone major disruption and some efforts at reform, and in this respect resembles the situation in West Germany. In addition, the Japanese university has traditionally been dominated by senior professors, and unlike Germany, this domination for the most part remains. For these and other reasons, the Japanese academic profession has also received considerable attention, although the bulk of research has been published in Japanese and is not available in translation.[17]

Several other European nations have been undergoing major reforms in their academic systems which will inevitably have implications for the recruitment pattern, power, attitudes, and orientations of the academic profession.[18] These reforms are far beyond any which have been implemented in the United States or Canada, and deserve to be watched carefully by American observers. It is interesting that the French university system, which underwent considerable change as a result of the student unrest of 1968, has not altered the role or perquisites of the professoriate significantly. Italy, faced with major problems in its academic system, has as yet not altered the role of the faculty.[19] As indicated, the situation in West Germany is mixed with some states engaged in massive reform while others follow fairly traditional patterns. Indeed, a comparative study of the differing development of German higher education would be a useful undertaking. The Netherlands has experienced perhaps the

most far reaching reforms in terms of their effects on the professoriate.[20] Conditions of academic work, patterns of governance, and even teacher-student relationships have been affected. The recent Swedish reforms, now being implemented, will also result in changes for the academic profession, but little analysis has appeared as yet. Changes in Denmark are also taking place.

Some of the best social science research on academics has taken place in Britain, where the traditional roles of the professoriate has not changed dramatically. Volumes by Halsey and Trow and by Gareth Williams and associates are among the most useful available.[21] These British studies represent a variety of social science disciplines from survey research to participant-observation and it is possible to obtain a fairly broad perspective from these, and several other research studies. The fact that an infrastructure of research interest, including an organization devoted to higher education (the Society for Research Into Higher Education), at least one major center for research on postsecondary education (at Lancaster University) and several journals contributes to the substantial body of research.[22]

Several Third World nations have received some attention from social scientists. Two doctoral dissertations done at the University of Chicago focus on the academic profession in Latin America.[23] Richard Pelczar's recent article summarizes much of the current Latin American research.[24] India, with its large academic system and politically important faculty has received some research attention.[25] The Indian research indicates that the Indian professoriate has not developed a fully professionalized academic climate, perhaps reflecting a relatively short academic tradition and the financial and other problems which beset the universities in India. One of the most interesting studies of higher education in the Third World is by sociologist Pierre van den Berghe, who relies on participant-observation techniques in his analysis of an African university.[26] This analysis indicates that universities in Anglophone Africa are much closer to the British model than Indian institutions, and that the academic profession exhibits behavior and attitudes more similar to their Western counterparts. There is not much other analysis of the academic profession in other Third World nations, and the scope for such research is quite broad.[27]

This brief bibliographical survey is necessarily incomplete and intended to provide an overview of the literature and indication of how limited it is. As noted, there is very little which is truly comparative in nature, and much of the literature consists of institutional case studies. The bulk of the literature has been produced by social scientists and not by specialists on higher education, although there is a growing community of spe-

cialists in a number of nations--most notably in Japan, West Germany and Britain. It is likely that the United States has produced twice the number of studies on academics done in the rest of the world combined.[28] Further, the data base for these American studies is generally larger and more comprehensive than it is for other countries. There is, for example, no counterpart of the Carnegie Commission survey of faculty.

Generalizations in the International Literature

There are a number of general impressions of the academic profession that are evident from a survey of the comparative literature. These impressions are just that; they have not been subjected to careful analysis but are based on often cursory perusal of literature representing different levels of analytical sophistication and orientations. These impressions are presented in outline form, and might be usefully replicated by adequately designed comparative research or by reference to individual nations.

1. The academic profession has grown dramatically in many nations and this growth has had major implications for the very nature of the academic community. Numerical growth has generally meant a loss of community and the broadening of the social class base of the profession. Growth has caused an increasing differentiation among academics into both disciplinary specialities and among different kinds of postsecondary institutions. The implications of growth on the profession is a major factor of the past twenty years of academic development.

2. In most countries, academics have tried to maintain their professional identities despite pressures in the opposite direction. In some nations, this has placed stress on research and publication as goals for advancement.

3. The autonomy of the academic community is under attack, and in general the professoriate has not been successful in protecting its prerogatives, its preferred institutional structures, and the like. The professoriate has been affected--to its own view negatively--by reform efforts in many nations. Academics in some countries have organized opposition to reform and in some cases have battled them in the courts. While some cases have been successful, the major thrust of reform has not been blunted.

4. The professoriate tends to oppose reform efforts, and

usually wishes to maintain traditional patterns of university operation and governance. Efforts to increase accountability have also been opposed, without major success, by the professoriate.

5. There has been a trend toward the democratization of the professoriate and for the most part this trend has been generated from outside the profession. In many nations, junior faculty have begun to participate in academic governance and decision making on curricular and other matters for the first time.

6. The professoriate has been able to blunt some reform efforts by "underground" opposition and by quietly refusing to implement some reforms. Senior faculty especially have not been anxious to broaden participation in governance and have moved slowly on some kinds of curriculum reforms.

7. For a decade or more, the academic profession has been getting younger. Expansion brought younger individuals into the system and this helped to break down traditional patterns of behavior and attitudes. This trend has stopped in many nations as university expansion has been curtailed or stopped altogether. A number of experts agree that an increasingly static academic labor market will cause difficulties in the coming decades.

8. The traditions of the academic profession differ substantially from country to country, and generalizations sometimes are difficult because of these differences. The definition of a professor may differ, salaries vary widely, teaching and research responsibilities are not always similar, and in general the conditions of work are not uniform across national boundaries. The attitudes, perceptions, and socialization patterns of academics differ from country to country in part because of historical traditions and current circumstances.

There are no doubt other generalizations which could be generated by a more thorough analysis of the literature. There are also difficulties in generalizing from national or institutional data. The inherent problems of comparative research are reflected in the fact that there is relatively little cross-national research available. Academic systems differ substantially from nation to nation, and these differences limit the kinds of generalizations that can be made. While the roots of most academic systems are similar, many crucial details differ. The nature of governance, the kinds of state controls, the

processes of academic appointment, the tenure system, and many other elements all play a crucial role in determining the nature and orientation of the professoriate. Some university systems generally require a doctorate for academic employment while others do not. Some systems tend to "inbreed" faculties, while others seldom hire graduates of their own institutions. In some universities, academic freedom is carefully safeguarded, while in others faculty members must be careful not to upset political authorities. In some nations, universities are at the center of oppositional politics, while others exhibit little if any political involvement. Some academic systems stress research and scholarly publication as an element of career advancement, while other universities do not have these expectations.

Because of these and other national (or even regional) differences one must be careful to limit generalizations. It is very difficult to design cross-cultural research which takes into account the many differences in academic systems which will inevitably limit the kinds of generalizations that can be made. For these reasons, the most effective comparative writing has been at the broadest level of generality and has avoided detailed comparisons between nations or university systems since such generalization would require so many limiting variables so as to be of questionable value. Thus, one can speak of such topics of the future of academic freedom in the world. But a cross-national discussion of the role of collective bargaining in higher education would require lengthy discussions of academic traditions, governance patterns, and other variables that would limit the generalizations that could be made.

These comments are not intended to argue against comparative research, but only to indicate that such research must be carefully planned and that it must take into account the relevant national and regional differences which effective hypotheses generate. In some respects, the use of single nation studies in an ad hoc way is a constructive means of generating insights into general patterns of higher education. It is also possible to utilize universities which have sufficient common elements so as to make comparative generalizations possible. Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson's classic volume Universities: British, Indian, African is an example of this kind of careful research aimed at consideration of nations with similar academic traditions and asking limited kinds of questions of the available data.[29]

Despite these limitations, comparative and cross-national consideration of the academic profession has some uses. It is clear that the amount of comparative research conducted thus far does not permit a fair evaluation of the usefulness of the tech-

nique, since it has not been attempted very often. Perhaps the most valuable use of comparative research is in the initial stages of research and analysis concerning a single nation. A consideration of the ways in which other universities work or of the problems encountered in other nations can sharpen research foci, generate useful hypotheses, and in general sensitize researchers to elements of the problem which might not be evident from the consideration of a single academic system. This value of comparative research works as well for studies of the academic profession as for other topics. For example, the kinds of research questions asked in West Germany concerning the reactions of faculty members to the reform process may shed light on similar issues in the United States or Canada.

Comparative research also has use for policy makers and those concerned with the actual operation of universities. Despite differences in university systems and in societies, a consideration of the ways in which academic tenure functions in a number of nations might be a useful exercise for those concerned with planning for changes in tenure systems. A careful consideration of the role of, for example, the Association of University Teachers in Britain might have some relevance to those considering academic collective bargaining in the United States.

If there is an understanding of the limitations of cross-national data and research as well as the value of such research, then comparative consideration of the academic profession--and of other topics related to higher education--can be quite valuable. It can help to generate hypotheses, it can enlighten policy making, and perhaps most important, it can provide a broadening of perspectives and orientations. The experiences of other nations may alert researchers to problems in their own nation. The examination of an academic system which has already expanded dramatically to see what effects this expansion had might be of use to academic systems on the verge of expansion.

A useful first step would be to provide readily available access to bibliographical data concerning comparative higher education in general and studies of the academic profession in particular. The bibliography project of the International Council for Educational Development was an effort in this direction, but this project has ended.[30] Much data relating to comparative higher education is difficult to obtain, as it is published in obscure places, is written in languages which are not readily accessible, and in general does not appear in the usual American scholarly sources. The ERIC bibliography system, for example, has very little of a comparative nature in its holdings. Some kind of clearing house relating to higher education outside the United States might help to provide access to data. Journals

such as Higher Education, Comparative Education Review, Comparative Education, Minerva, the International Review of Education, the Bulletin of the International Association of Universities and several others have provided a focus for writing relating to comparative topics.

It seems clear that a comparative perspective on the academic profession will provide a very useful added dimension to research on this topic and perhaps even more important, to conceptual thinking about the professoriate. The methodological and other problems related to undertaking specifically comparative research may well limit large scale research projects. But this does not mean that comparative perspectives cannot become an important part of our thinking about the professoriate. As indicated in this paper, there is already a small body of research available. This research will provide added perspective and may be useful in generating hypotheses. At the very least, it will diminish the evident insularity of American social science research about higher education.

FOOTNOTES

1. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.

2. Theodore Caplow and Reece McGee, Academic Marketplace, New York: Basic Books, 1958.

3. See Martin Trow, ed., Teachers and Students, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, and Everett Carl Ladd, Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset, The Divided Academy, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

4. See for example Peter M. Blau, The Organization of Academic Work, New York: Wiley, 1973, and Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, The American University, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

5. An exception is S.M. Lipset, Rebellion in the University, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976, chapter 6.

6. Robert Merton, The Sociology of Science, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973. See also Warren O. Hagstrom, The Scientific Community, New York: Basic Books, 1965.

7. See E.C. Ladd and S.M. Lipset, op. cit., for a good example of a "political" analysis.

8. A recent collection of papers dealing with individual countries provides the best approximation of comparative work. See Philip G. Altbach, ed., Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession, New York: Praeger, 1977.

9. Several essentially statistical reports concerning the professoriate exist. See, for example, International Association of Universities, The Staffing of Higher Education, Paris: International Association of Universities, n.d., Richard Shryock, ed., The Status of University Teachers, Ghent: International Association of University Professors and Lecturers, 1961. Ms. Arpi Hamalian of Concordia University in Montreal is currently completing a doctoral thesis using large-scale questionnaire data concerning the professoriate in the United States and Britain. In addition, several of the standard books on comparative higher education such as Barbara Burn, Higher Education in Nine Countries, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971 and

Christopher Driver, The Exploding University, (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971 feature extensive discussions of the academic profession. Council for Cultural Cooperation, Council of Europe, Mobility of University Staff, Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, 1973, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Quantitative Trends in Teaching Staff in Higher Education, Paris: OECD, 1971.

10. Philip G. Altbach, ed., Comparative Higher Education Abroad: Bibliography and Analysis, New York: Praeger, 1976.

11. On the medeval university, see for example, Charles Haskins, The Rise of Universities, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957, pp. 27-58.

12. Fritz Ringer, The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969. See also R. Steven Turner, "University Reformers and Professorial Scholarship in Germany 1760-1806," in L. Stone, ed., The University in Society, Vol. 2, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 495-532.

13. See Arthur Engel, "The Emerging Concept of the Academic Profession at Oxford, 1800-1854, in L. Stone, ed., The University in Society, Vol. 1, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974, pp. 305-351.

14. L. Stone, ed., op. cit.

15. Edward Shils, "The Academic Profession in India," Minerva, 7 (Spring, 1969), pp. 345-372, and Irene Gilbert, "The Indian Academic Profession: The Origins of a Tradition of Subordination," Minerva, 10 (July, 1972), pp. 384-411. See also Daniel Socolow, "The Argentine Professoriate: Occupational Insecurity and Political Interference," Comparative Education Review, (October, 1973), pp. 375-388.

16. Herbert Doring, "Deutsche Professoren zwischen Kaiserreich and Drittem Reich," Neue politische literatur, No. 3 (July-September, 1974), pp. 340-352, Alexander Busch, "The Vicissitudes of the 'Privatdozent': Breakdown and Adaptation in the Recruitment of the German University Teacher," Minerva, 1 (Spring, 1963), pp. 319-340, Marlis Krueger and Baerbel Wallisch-Prinz, "University Reform in West Germany," Comparative Education Review, 16 (June, 1972), pp. 340-351. See also Helmut Schelsky, Einsamkeit and Freiheit, (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1963), and German Universities Commission, Report on German Universities, New York: International Council

on the Future of the University, 1977.

17. William Cummings, "Understanding Behavior in Japan's Academic Marketplace," Journal of Asian Studies, 34 (February, 1975), pp. 313-340, Michiya Shimbori, "The Academic Marketplace in Japan," The Developing Economies, 7 (December, 1969), pp. 617-636, Michiya Shimbori, "Comparative Study of Career Patterns of College Professors," International Review of Education, 10 (No. 3, 1964), pp. 284-296.

18. For a general discussion of French university reform with some reference to academics, see Michelle Patterson, "Conflict, Power and Structure: Crisis and Reform in the French University," (Unpublished PhD Dissertation), Yale University, 1975.

19. Guido Martinotti and Alberto Ciasanti, "The Robed Baron: The Academic Profession in the Italian University," Higher Education, 6 (May, 1977), pp. 189-208. See also Burton Clark, Academic Power in Italy, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

20. Hans Daelder, "The Dutch Universities Between the 'New Democracy' and the 'New Management'", Minerva, 12 (April, 1974), pp. 221-257. See Edward Shils, "The Academic Ethos Under Strain," Minerva, 13 (Spring, 1975), pp. 1-37 for a similarly critical evaluation of recent reform trends.

21. A.H. Halsey and M.A. Trow, The British Academics, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971, Gareth Williams, Tessa Blackstone and David Metcalf, The Academic Labour Market: Economic and Social Aspects of a Profession, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1974. See also Tessa Blackstone and Oliver Fulton, "Man and Women Academics: An Anglo-American Comparison of Subject Choices and Research Activity," Higher Education, 3 (April, 1974), pp. 119-140, and M.P. Hornsby-Smith, "The Working Life of the University Lecturer," Universities Quarterly, 28 (Spring, 1974), pp. 149-163. See also Gareth Williams, "Gentlemen and Players: The Changing British Professoriate," in P.G. Altbach, ed., Comparative Perspectives on the Academic Profession, op. cit., pp. 9-22.

22. For France, see F. Caussen, "The Human Cost of French University Expansion; Academics Without Careers," Minerva, 11 (July, 1973), pp. 372-386.

23. R.J. Socolow, "The Full Time Professoriate in Argentina,"

(Unpublished PhD Dissertation), University of Chicago, 1972 and Richard Pelczar, "The University Professor in Columbia: A Role Analysis," (Unpublished PhD Dissertation), University of Chicago, 1973.

24. Richard Pelczar, "The Latin American Professoriate: Progress and Prospects," Higher Education, 6 (May, 1977), in press.

25. Philip G. Altbach, "In Search of Saraswati: The Ambivalence of the Indian Academic," Higher Education, 6 (May, 1977), pp. 255-295, Suma Chitnis, "Teachers in Higher Education," in A. Singh and P. Altbach, eds., The Higher Learning in India, Delhi: Vikas, 1974, pp. 237-250, Thomas Eisemon, U.S. Educated Engineering Faculty in India, Bombay: Tata Institute of Social Sciences, 1974, and Yogendra Singh, "Academic Role Structure and Modernization: A Study of University Teachers," in S. Saberwal, ed., Beyond the Village: Sociological Explorations, Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1972, pp. 195-243.

26. Pierre van den Berghe, Power and Privilege at an African University, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973, pp. 122-147.

27. Jan Prybyla, "The Life of a Chinese Professor," Journal of General Education, 26 (Fall, 1974), pp. 195-204.

28. A recent study which provides some comparative discussion is Burton R. Clark and Ted I.K. Youn, Academic Power in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976.

29. Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson, Universities: British, Indian, African. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

30. Two bibliographical publications resulted from the ICED Bibliography Project. These are, Philip G. Altbach, ed., op. cit., and Philip G. Altbach and David H. Kelly, Higher Education in Developing Nations. New York: Praeger, 1974.

THEORY AND PRACTICE IN THE USE OF SURVEY METHODS: THE CASE OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

by

Gerald M. Platt

Introduction

The survey method can be characterized as bad ethnography. This metaphor is corroborated by the fact that surveys like ethnographies tend to take the overview approach to phenomena but unlike ethnographies they do not offer rich and "authentic" detail.

By survey method I mean the processes of constructing, circulating, and analyzing questionnaires or interviews (open and/or closed ended items, etc.) which have been responded to by a systematically sampled population selected from a specified universe of persons, statuses, etc. I have defined the survey method in this fashion because it conforms with theoretic definition of the method and because I want to discuss its use in both theory and practice.[1] I will emphasize practice over theory in the use of the survey method; a considerable amount has been written about the theory of the survey method but much less emphasis has been given to the implications of practice for an understanding of the phenomena of interest, that is, the understanding of the academic profession through the use of the survey method.[2]

I have employed the survey method in my study of faculty. It was through this method's use that I became aware of its advantages and disadvantages. I will illustrate the points I make from my own writings and from other studies of academics. This discussion is aimed at not eliminating the failures of the survey method for the total elimination of shortcomings in survey analysis is a practical impossibility. Instead I will offer a realistic appraisal of the method's use in understanding the academic profession and in understanding any social phenomenon.

An Exemplary Abuse of the Survey Method: Selecting the Universe

Contrasting the literature on survey method to its users as

these are found in sociological research reports which have employed this approach indicates that violating the ideal of survey analysis is a commonplace practice. Indeed, often the violations are justified in terms of practical circumstances which the investigators encounter in conducting their research and in analyzing their data. I will suggest herein that practical violation of the ideal of survey analysis is endemic to its use and cannot be eliminated from every phase of the research.

Survey method suggests that the theory organizing the research should define the universe of persons, statuses, or more generally, the universe of units from which a sample population will be drawn for interviewing. Thus, the initial problem which besets the researchers is in theoretically defining the universe and then in selecting a sample which is representative of the universe population. Such procedures assure the researchers that the empirically selected population will reflect the theoretically defined population.

In our study, Parsons and I defined the universe of faculty as all persons holding full or part-time departmental positions at four-year liberal arts colleges and universities. This meant that we would sample only those men and women faculty who had departmental appointments at 1,100 four-year liberal arts institutions. Administrators, teaching assistants, faculty at junior or community colleges, and faculty at teachers, vocational, and technical colleges could not be part of our sample. We had so defined the universe because we conceived of the academic profession as an influence system shaped by the research and teaching of the faculty at such institutions.

By contrast, I recall consulting with Professors Martin Trow, Joseph Zelan, Carlos Kruytbosch, and others in Berkeley to devise the 1969 survey of academics for the Carnegie Commission study. One of our discussions focused upon the universe of statuses and institutions to be included in the study. The way we had defined the universe for our faculty study did not satisfy the Berkeley researchers. They believed the academic universe included a whole spectrum of statuses in all the entitled higher educational institutions. Thus, their universe included not only faculty but also administrators, research faculty, teaching assistants, students, etc., at all twenty-four hundred institutions of higher education in the United States.

The Berkeley sociologists offered criteria for defining this as their investigatory universe. They were less interested in influences in the system and they were more interested in an overview of operations of higher education in its every aspect

at every type of institution. And further, some of their research teams were especially interested in studying particular segments of higher education such as faculty at community and junior colleges or teaching assistants at the large universities, and so on. The Carnegie study would be occasion for gathering information on these segments of higher education.

It is not my intention to laud or to fault any specific study. I cannot stress enough that my own research is as liable, as any other study mentioned herein, to the analysis I will pursue. Thus, I wish to suggest that despite the theoretical justification offered for the definition of the universes in both studies of higher education, practical considerations were involved in deciding upon the units included in the research boundary.

By practical considerations or decisions I mean activities or courses of action which are directed by considerations of the conditions, exigencies, expediencies, needs, shortcomings, outcomes, private or collective interests, etc., involved in conducting the research and in pursuing or accomplishing the research project. Practical considerations or decisions thus contrast with research decisions which are made according to theoretic or methodologic rule, as these rules are ideally explicated in the theory and methods which guide the research.

Especially to illustrate I have selected how practical considerations are involved in the selection of the universe because this is one area of research which should be most removed from such practicality. Since the universe is a hypothetical population and, since this is a potential population being defined, this aspect of the research should be least constrained by practical matters. It is the one domain of research which should be totally available to accomplishment by theoretic rule.

And yet we have already demonstrated how this was not the case among the Berkeley researchers. Each member had specific and special interests and so pressed for the inclusion of larger segments of the higher educational system into the universe. Each by their interests pressed for an expansion of the universe population and thereby with each increasing segment changed the definition of the boundaries of the academic universe. Simultaneously this process changed the definition of the boundaries of the academic profession and thus changed the definition of the very phenomenon itself.

We too had practical considerations involved in defining our academic universe. We did not consider the community and junior colleges significant in shaping the dominant value

orientation or character of higher education in the United States and thus they were eliminated from our universe. Simultaneously, we considered faculty at the best public and private universities and colleges especially important in this process and therefore all the higher educational institutions which conformed to these standards were part of our universe.

However, if practical considerations of the type suggested above were the only ones involved in selecting the universe, we could not generate a convincing argument regarding the effects of practical consideration in selecting the universe. For with careful and scrupulous adherence to theory, it might be possible to eliminate such personal considerations and thus define the universe independent of the private interests of the research team members. But despite the importance and frequent influence of private interests, practical considerations relating to the selection of the universe go beyond such private concerns. The essential, irremovable practical consideration regarding selecting any universe is that the selection is made in relation to the audience to which the research is directed.

Let me elaborate this point in another way. Social scientific research is conducted in a social setting. Researchers as colleagues and as a collective are oriented to their own reference groups. The standards, the interests, the pressures of these reference groups influence the research procedures and this was the case in the selection of the universe in our study of higher education and the Berkeley research group was similarly effected.

Surely scientific values are part of the social sciences and therefore any research group will be oriented to these and their work will, in part, reflect such standards. However, the groups to which social scientists refer are organized and oriented not only by scientific standards. Thus, social research procedures will also, in part, reflect these other, nonscientific standards.[3]

For our study the audience was the scholarly disciplines. It has always been a supposition among the scholarly disciplines that the academic community is essentially defined by what faculty write and teach.[4] Therefore, the universe and the sample from which we drew reflected the fact that our research was oriented to the academic community so defined; the research would be returned to the scholarly disciplines for its evaluation. There was from outset little consideration that our work, despite its empirical focus, would have any other but theoretical significance for the scholarly community and that therefore the research would be oriented to and by that community.

The Berkeley researchers had different reference groups. They would return their research findings to the Carnegie Commission, to the whole of practicing academe, that is, to the many statuses which participate in and comprise the academic profession, to the policy makers in and outside the profession, and so on. With such a potential audience, Berkeley workers had to be prepared to have findings on every aspect of higher education. This practical feature, that is, the audience to which the research is pegged, cannot be eliminated from the selection of the universe; it is endemic to the selection process and it is exemplary of every survey research project.

Survey research is conducted in a social network. The accomplishments of any social network are characterized by practical decisions which involve contextual interpretations of ideal procedural rules. The contextual rule to which we have pointed regarding the modification of theoretical rule in selecting the universe is that of attention to the future destination of the research. It is impossible for living human beings interacting in social networks to cut off from present consideration the future consequences and impact of their actions. Thus, the only way to remove practical considerations from survey analysis would be to remove it from the social configuration of its accomplishment, which is to say, "do not do social research."

We have already implied that practical considerations shape the research and thus the character of the phenomena in ways which are as forceful as ideal theoretical and methodological procedures. Thus, practical decisions carry with them meanings for the phenomena and thus for our understanding of the phenomena studied. We have demonstrated that practical decisions shape our conception of the universe of academia through their influence on the definition of the phenomenon, that is, inclusion and exclusion of units of analysis within the boundary of the academic system. Since the character of the phenomena is shaped by practical considerations, the findings which accrue from such research will reflect the influences of such practical considerations. And therefore, in turn, our image and understanding of the phenomena will be shaped by such practical considerations.

We are not discussing bias in defining the universe or in selecting the sample, problems which so frequently concern survey researchers. Instead we are pointing to the ways in which practical considerations shape the very image of the phenomena. We are suggesting that different practical impingements on researchers will produce different versions of

the same nominal phenomenon. Studies of the academic profession, including my own, have been so effected.

The Pervasiveness and Necessity of Practicality in Survey Research

If, as we suggest, practical research decisions are a product of the social network of their pursuit, then this is tantamount to saying every research procedure will be imbued with such standards since all sociological research is conducted within the frame of social relations. It will therefore serve us well to demonstrate the necessity of practical decisions in typical research procedures and the standard reasons for their use.

By contrast with other research procedures, practical considerations involved in selecting the universe remain implicit or unnoted by the researcher. However, survey researchers readily acknowledge practical decisions in the routine analytic procedures of their research. Indeed, the daily research practices of the laboratory are characterized by a practical "make do" attitude.

For example, in our own national survey of faculty we received a 65 percent response rate from the faculty members sent questionnaires. Only a year later the Carnegie Commission study received a 60 percent response rate. Ladd and Lipset considered this "A very high return of completed questionnaires..."[5] Actually, there is no theoretical standard for assessing the level of the return as high, medium, or low. This is a practical judgment made by contrasting returns to other known surveys.

Since 1969 the return rates in studies of academics have been declining. The bombardment of academics with questionnaires, the increasing tensions in the academic world, and fears regarding the consequent uses of the results have perhaps coalesced to make respondents less willing to participate in such studies. In our own work we encouraged the respondents to answer and return the questionnaire by using a prestigious letterhead, a letter which suggested the importance of the work to <u>our</u> profession; the questionnaire was twice sent to the respondent; a post card reminder followed the second questionnaire mailing; and, in areas of the country where we had field workers, respondents who had not returned the second questionnaire were called. The Carnegie researchers followed similar strategies with their respondents. But these research techniques are not theoretical or methodological rules to correct declining returns. Instead, they are suggestions for increasing respondent returns based upon societal norms, which are shared by the researcher and the respondent. Survey researchers who have experienced recalcitrant respondents have offered practical techniques based upon their

knowledge of such norms. However, such techniques for increasing response rates are not theoretic or scientific rules because they are effective only insofar as the respondents continue to comply with the norms upon which they are based.[6] The result is that such techniques are practical rules of thumb which fail when respondents are motived by other interests, rules, fears, etc., which recently appears to be the case.

There is, however, good theoretical reason for being concerned about decreasing returns for there is greater likelihood of garnering unrepresentative samples with small returns. Despite the growing concern regarding the size and thus quality of the sample, the surveyor will not be deterred from pursuing the analysis. Under these circumstances the survey researcher will attempt to check and to rectify the sample. The sample returns can be checked against some known characteristics of the universe such as the proportion of returns from different institutions against the proportion of the different types of institutions in the universe, or the distribution of faculty statuses in the sample compared with the distribution of faculty statuses in the universe, etc. Should these characteristics in the sample not significantly vary from the distribution of the characteristics in the universe, then the researcher can have greater confidence in their sample despite small returns. However, this procedure of comparing sample frequencies to universe frequencies does not assure the researcher that representativeness has been achieved but only that the sample is comparable to the universe on these dimensions of comparison and therefore, there may be greater confidence in the quality of the findings.

Where significant differences are found in these comparisons between the sample and the universe, then weighting could be used to produce statistically a "representative" sample. However, there is controversy as to whether such weighting truly eliminates the bias, although it may generate more numbers for the tables so that they appear representative. In both instances of adjustment and rectification, however, the analysis is made precarious because the researchers cannot be assured the findings obtained from the sample of respondents reflects the opinions, behaviors, etc. of the universe to which they wish to generalize.

The solution to sample bias is clearly a practical one throughout. Adjusting and checking the sample is a practical consideration to permit the analysis to continue in the face of faculty returns. Therefore, while it is nice to have a large and representative sample, failing its achievement the research will proceed regardless of the size and quality of the sample. The typical practical considerations involved here are well known in survey research circles. A great deal of time, energy,

and money have been spent on the project by the time the returns are obtained. The research may be supported by an external agency which expects, at least, a report for its sponsorship. Careers and reputations hinge on these reports and the publications which may accrue from such sponsored research. The need to show something for years of effort enters into the pursuit of the analysis despite the shortcomings of respondent returns. While the practical does not submerge the theoretical in this, or in any aspect of the research, the researchers cannot, in the face of practical demands, be guided entirely by the theoretical rules if they are to complete their investigations. In the face of the forces from the practical, the theoretical is bent and compromised.

The same practical attitude characterizes the statistical analysis of data. Parametric statistics are used although the data may warrant nonparametric analysis. The decisions are practical ones entirely; the parametric statistics offer more analytic power. Scales are built even when the items are unscalable or where there are too few items to construct a scale. The scale is needed for practical reasons to distribute the sample along some important continuum of attitudes or beliefs which are related to some other variables.

Age categories (or any other category) are established in terms of convenient cutting points distributing the sample into equal segments or in categories large enough for statistical manipulation. The researchers do not ask and they cannot ask if these categories constitute theoretically cohesive units; do the persons in the age categories identify the category as an age solidarity and do they refer to their age at all to make decisions about other aspects of their lives. The researchers assume these categories for the convenience of the research; yet each practical decision about a cutting point in a distribution of attributes assumes the significance of those divisions for the respondent. Such a practical decision imputes meanings to the respondents which they may very well not hold themselves.

Often in simple percent analyses marginal differences among the different categories may be quite small. Ladd and Lipset found the very small percentage differences among Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faculty on a whole array of academic and political issues and yet they made a great deal of Jewish faculty liberalism.[7] And we found only an 11 percent difference between faculty at the "best universities" and those at the "least prestigious colleges" regarding the emphasis they placed on undergraduate cognitive learning and yet we too made much of this difference in our analysis.[8] Similarly, more sophisticated multivariate analysis will make a great deal of small but statis-

tically significant associations.

Researchers may not be pleased with such findings and yet they are faced with the practical problem of "making sense" of them, that is, of transforming the statistical trends, as meager as they may be, into a narrative discourse. The findings cannot speak for themselves and the researcher must interpret their meaning. In doing so, intentionally or unintentionally, the researcher turns small trends into absolutes which on occasion have acted as the bases for policy decisions.

This is not an attempt to establish a litany of bad research procedures which can be rectified. Rather, as I have previously suggested, good and bad survey researchers must make some or all of these practical decisions because their research is conducted in a social network. Researchers must examine the pertinent dimensions and ask significant questions of their findings. But the survey method by its very nature cannot provide the researcher with all of the information necessary to examine the data in all possible significant ways. The researchers may want to develop a perfect scale but may not have the data resources to develop it. In the conflict between theoretical and methodological purity and no scale at all, the researchers opt for the practical compromise. The researcher may want to know the categories, i.e., age, sex, religious, ethnic, etc., to which the respondents refer when they decide about, or act in, different areas of life. But these may be shifting references for the respondents' and are unavailable in the information already gathered from them. Thus, the researchers opt for the tried and proven standardized categories conveniently split into such as equal-sized age classes despite the fact that these are fixed in their meaning and the researchers are not sure that they have any meaningful relationship to the respondent. The potential richness and detail of the findings are sacrificed for the convenience of simplifying and completing the work.

In this phase of the research the practical dominates the theoretical because the theoretical would be impossible to accomplish within the constraints of the survey method. The analytic procedures in the laboratory demand that the researchers work with what they have. The overview approach, the types of questions asked (fixed, probing, background, or whatever), the one shot investigation, the inability to know shifting meanings of issues to respondents, and the like are constituent features of the survey research findings once the data are in the laboratory and it is these with which the researchers must work. The practical course of action permits the researchers to achieve answers to research questions asked given the available data.

Theoretical and methodological purity at this point would prohibit the accomplishment of the research. Thus, not only are practical decisions a part of every phase of the research, they are, in the data analysis phase, a necessary feature in order to complete the research.

Further Implications of Practical Decisions for the Description of the Phenomenon

At the outset of this paper I described the survey method as bad ethnography. I want to elaborate this imagery in light of the discussion of practical decisions.

The term survey connotes an overview approach, for example, in contrast to the experimental method.[9] There are two meanings to survey as it is used in sociological research. The first meaning is that of an investigation, that is, the description of the distribution of attitudes, opinions, activities, background characteristics, etc. of a given collective population such as the academic profession. The second connotative meaning of survey is that of a comprehensive, that is, a broad gauged investigation of the dimensions, features, parameters of a collective population of interest. The result of both these orienting meanings is that surveys do end up being in one or in both ways overviews of the population. Our work, the work of the Carnegie study and many other surveys of academics, exhibit these characteristics. Surveys, therefore, involve the researchers in broad-gauged studies of a "society" in a manner similar to the ways in which ethnographers attempt wide ranging examinations of societies.

Like the ethnographer, survey researchers must gain a preknowledge of the culture, social structure, personalities, activities and so on of the study population before embarking upon the research. Typically it has been suggested that researchers gain such preknowledge by reading already published materials on the topic, through unsystematic interviewing of the population, through direct observation, pilot studies, acquaintance through participation, and so on.[10] In the case of higher education we have both the available literature and for many of us personal experience with it as participants. In our research we went further in developing this knowledge. We unsystematically interviewed academics and we performed a pilot study of the academic profession.[11]

Despite this familiarity with the social world of the population survey researchers do not have a specific and systematic

knowledge of population; in important ways the world of the respondents remain removed and ambiguous to the researcher. It is the distance and ambiguity that warrants further research. For some areas of the respondents' social and personal world the researcher may have a great deal of information while for others there is uncertainty and even a complete absence of information. In the face of this complexity and vagueness the researchers must devise the research instrument with which systematic information will be ferreted out about the respondents and their world.

In an effort to overcome the vagueness and ambiguity the researchers examine each area of research interest from several points of view. More specifically, any single research issue is not examined by a single question or item but by several items differently phrased regarding the same issue. Thus, researchers can assure themselves that they will receive the statistical variance on the issue that they must have for their analysis.

The phrasing of these questions for the questionnaire or the interview, is based upon the preknowledge of the respondents' world and upon the researcher's subjective and intuitive judgments of the way the issue might be approached, the boundaries of the issue, the characteristics related to the issue, and so on. The researchers are attempting to fit the phrasing of the several different items to converge on the same issue and most importantly to have the items correspond with the world view of the respondent. Throughout all of this the researchers hope, but they are not sure, that their formulations of the items will be congruent with the respondents' formulations of their own world view.

After circulating the questionnaire, an analysis of the items regarding a single issue will show that some vary considerably and others show little variation. The items which vary are analyzed and are treated as indicative of the issue. Then the researchers must make sense of the variance. To do so the researchers must review the content, pattern, and relation of the items to each other (and to other variables) and, given these findings, they must impute the respondents' intentions that could have produced the patterns.

Thus, the first strategy the survey researchers employ to bring their view of the respondents' world into congruence with the respondents' views of their world is to retrospectively make sense of the statistical findings; that is, to make sense of how the respondents could have been "motivated" to produce the aggregate statistical response patterns.

In accomplishing this, only infrequently do researchers literally employ theory to make these interpretations. Rather

such interpretations tend to be ad hoc practical considerations made by researchers about the respondents' interpretive procedures. Having based their own framework of potential alternative answers or choices given the researchers' knowledge of the respondents' world, the researchers now interpret the respondents' replies again in light of their preknowledge and practical considerations. The researchers hark back in a circular manner, with little new knowledge of the respondents' intended meaning, and attempt to make sense out of the systematically ascertained findings.

In following this procedure, the researchers have gone no further into the respondents' world than was initially known. Indeed, the most prominent feature of this process is the imputation of motives, intentions, factors, pressures, causes to the respondents which are still no more than the researchers' already established conception of the respondents' world, embellished and now superimposed back upon that world.

While this then is the practical construction of the respondents' world in terms of aggregate responses, there is an even more basic level at which this practical constructive process occurs. For example, even the simplest of closed-ended items must have a meaning to the respondents in order for them to be able to answer it. And in constructing items the researchers aim to achieve a correspondence of meaning between the meaning they wish to convey in the items and the meaningful interpretation of the items the respondents achieve. However, modern language analysis indicates that even the simplest of sentences has the potential for multiple interpretations rather than having context free or invariant meanings.[12]

There is little chance that the researchers and respondents can achieve such a common meaning. The more complex the item's meaning structure, the greater the possibility for variant interpretation between the researchers' intention and the respondents' rendering. Researchers thus find themselves imputing meaning to any item answered by respondents; at the level of aggregate responses researchers are imputing invariant meaning, invariant cause, invariant purpose, etc., to a large number of respondents. And since researchers have sovereignty in interpreting the respondents' meanings, it is in this sense that researchers let their conception of the respondents' social world dominate over the respondents' conception of their personal and social world.

What is being said here is that researchers do not know the meanings and intentions of respondents when they are answering the questionnaire or the interview. The researchers therefore

turn again to their knowledge of the collective population to impute what might have been the intentions of the respondents. Thus, without the assurity of the knowledge of the respondents' intentions and meanings, the researchers are combining their knowledge of the social world of the respondents with the response patterns to come up with an imputed meaning offered on behalf of the investigated population.

This is how practical considerations enter into making surveys bad ethnographies. It is in the construction of the instrument items, imputing their meanings to the respondents and interpreting the meaning of patterns of responses that the researchers are making practical decisions about the character of the world of the respondent population. By contrast, the ethnographer attempts to permeate the culture of the respondents and to describe it from within. The ethnographer creates a description of the world closer to the lived world of the respondents. And further, the ethnographic methodology permits the researcher to continually refer to the respondent population for clarification and elaboration of their meaningful world.[13]

An additional general proposition about practical decisions in survey research emerges from this and the previous discussion. Every practical decision in survey research--whether regarding the universe, the construction of the investigatory instrument, the modes of analysis of data, the imputation of meaning to the items, and the imputation of meanings to the respondents response patterns--are the researchers' elections about the character of the cultural, social, and personal world of the respondent population. Thus, the character of the phenomenon portrayed in the sociological narrative is a product of the implicit meanings in the practical rules offered as these are combined with theoretical and methodological rules which guide the research. The narrative description, the image of the phenomenon, therefore, is only partly based upon the respondents' world view. The appearance of the academic world in every case of the survey analysis is a combination of the researchers' theoretical view, their practical decisions, and the respondents' responses to the survey instrument.

The Theoretic Use of the Survey Method in Describing the Academic Profession

It was not my intention to malign or to remedy the survey method, both of which we hope are now abundantly clear would serve no purpose. Rather, the purpose of the paper was stated previously, viz., to attempt a realistic appraisal of the survey method and its potential contribution to our knowledge of the

academic profession.

The advantage of the survey method, while simultaneously a weakness, is its capacity for offering overviews of a collective population. However, if such an overview is taken to mean, as it so often does, that a survey can tell us what is going on out there in the trenches of the academic profession, that the survey can tell it like it is, then we are still sorely deluded and should dispel this illusion.

Survey analysis, like all forms of sociological methodology, is a method of sense transformation. The methodologies are ways of transforming, making sense of, making meaningful, organizing the world about us. Thus, these methodologies offer the practicing sociologist rules for transforming the cultural, social, and personal worlds of the respondent populations. But unlike the physical and natural sciences which the social scientist attempts to emulate, sociological methodologies cannot be separated from already established transformational rules which are part of the sociologists' own life and their subjects' daily lives. As human beings sociologists already use language, values, norms, and practical rules to conduct their own lives and these cannot be removed from their professional activities, such as conducting scientific research.

The result is that the simplest research tasks are imbued with these influences. Thus, attempts at assiduous adherence to methodological rule, attempts at generating more complex and more precise methodologies or statistical analyses, will produce no more valuable or accurate accounts of the academic "reality." However, we are not advocating licensed methodological slovenliness. The impossibility of total objectivity does not warrant total subjectivity.

If, then, the survey method in studying the academic profession cannot be achieved in strict accord with methodological rule, then at least the findings can be systematized and assimilated to theory. If anything has consistently been missing in the study of the academic profession, it has been theoretical formulation and codification.[14]

Survey researchers have been especially guilty of avoiding theory. The survey researchers have moved from one to another problem method, in hand assuming the data would speak for themselves and perhaps hoping, in the end, that the findings would present a cohesive picture of higher education and the academic profession. But this has not, and obviously cannot, occur in the manner in which present surveys are proceeding.

A good many of the issues discussed herein can be assimilated to the problem of verification in the social sciences. Verification implies that scientific theories are written for potential substantiation through a demonstrated correspondence with the experiential world. This correspondence between the theory and experiential world is achieved by one or another form of empirical investigation of the world. But survey researchers have turned this scientific principle on its head by assuming the empirical world could describe itself through the use of survey analysis. An accurate picture of higher education and the academic profession could be amassed through the use of this technique. However, we have shown that there is no way to perform survey research without imputing meaning through the practical decisions the researchers make upon behalf of the respondents in order to accomplish the research. Thus, in every step of the research the survey analysts are building, often unbeknownst to themselves, implicit theories regarding the academic system.

There is a better way to proceed, one established in the scientific disciplines. This procedure involves building an explicit set of descriptive and analytic categories and specifying the rules relating these variables to each other. These analytic and descriptive categories and rules of relationship would in our case be about the academic profession. Thus, this process would create an image of the phenomena, what some have referred to as an ontology regarding a particular reality.

But this is to say that the first order of business in the scientific disciplines is to theorize. For what we have described, in very simple terms, is the process of theorizing. Theory about the academic profession makes explicit the structural and analytic categories by which it is conceived and simultaneously makes explicit the transformational rules by which those categories can be seen and discovered in the experiential world. The more precise are the categories and the relational propositions between them, the more exactly can the phenomena be described and analyzed. When theory is written with such precision, it is possible to spell out the procedures by which the analysis was accomplished. This is not to suggest that private interest will be totally eliminated from social research, but rather that an understanding of analytic and organizing principles will be known rather than hidden in practical, ad hoc, decisions.

Thus, the first task of the researchers is to develop formulations which offer an image of the social world and guide its investigation, an image of the world which is written for potential verification. It is then this image and the conceptual language which can be employed to systematically integrate and

analyze survey findings. I mean then to suggest no more than the consistent use of a particular framework to make sense of data already garnered about the academic profession and to make sense of those which will be garnered. The virtue of this approach is that at least the findings will be drawn into and organized by explicit theoretical rule. By consistently assimilating findings to a particular framework there is a possibility for generating a unified picture of the different segments of the academic profession.

We have attempted in our work to guide our research by such theoretical considerations. We have theoretically suggested that the academic system is guided by a common value which we have referred to as cognitive rationality.[15] We have suggested that this value is expressed in many different ways and contexts throughout the academic system. Although this value is most purely expressed in faculty scholarship and research, we have recently explored its influence in undergraduate teaching.

By comparing our own findings on undergraduate teaching orientations using our own data from 1968 and similar data gathered by the American Council on Education, in 1973 we were able to demonstrate, even though we did not have longitudinal or competely comparable data, that faculty continued to demonstrate their commitment to this value despite the many pressures upon them to stress other than cognitive orientations in their teaching. More explicitly we are able to show that with national samples of faculty, they were committed to cognitive values, that they have developed a dominant teaching orientation regarding this value which is a compromise between their value commitments and institutional demands, that as a result of this commitment they have, over the period of time involved, not considerably changed their undergraduate teaching goals.[16]

Subsequent to this publication we have taken these survey findings even further by theoretically analyzing, in detail, the faculty cultural (i.e., value commitments) in relation to their social obligations (i.e., institutional commitments) throughout the academic system. We have developed a technique of analysis which complements the survey approach, which we call the method of "visual display." With its use we attempted to sculpt an image of teaching environments which conform with our theoretical orientation. We attempted to demonstrate that higher educational undergraduate teaching itself constitutes a system of environments congruent with the Parsonian AGIL paradigm. Thus, we have suggested that value orientations and institutional obligations coalesce to produce four environments reflective of that paradigm. These environments entitled Cognitive Teaching, Traditional Liberal

Arts, Occupational-Liberal Arts, and Total Educational are related to one another, sharing much, and yet they are different from one another and form a system.[17]

The methodologies we have employed are controversial and the analysis highly inferential. And yet the image and conception of the higher educational undergraduate teaching as a system in these terms could not have been accomplished without the organizing principles of the theory. The theory brought our data together producing what we consider an exciting formulation of faculty teaching activities. We did not retreat to the faculty themselves to make sense of our data and thus our finding eschews that which is already commonsensically known about the teaching phenomena by every practicing academic.

Thus, theory is not only an organizing principle; it is a spur to imagination. It offers suggestions as to ways in which the appearance of the social world of the respondents could be produced, or more specifically, it suggests in theoretical terms how the findings could have come about. Simultaneously, theory prevents a retreat to the same world to explain that world. But being theoretical also demands imagination; it demands a leap of inference from the observed to the unobserved; it demands a venturing out into speculation.[18]

Truly imaginative theory will create truly imaginative images of the appearance of the world of the respondents and of the ways in which those respondents create such worlds. Some may retreat from such a suggestion, for it implies multiple formulations of a single reality bringing sociological theorizing closer to the humanities than to the sciences and thereby inhibiting the scientific development of a positivistic character to sociology. But such a concern built upon a positivistic conception of sociology is becoming more and more tenuous.[19]

FOOTNOTES

1. Norman K. Denzin, The Research Act, A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldine, 1970, p. 165.

2. Herbert Hyman, Survey Design and Analysis, Principles, Cases and Procedures. New York: The Free Press, 1955; Herbert Hyman, Secondary Analysis of Sample Surveys, Principles, Procedures and Potentialities. New York: Wiley, 1972; Morris Rosenberg, The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968. Aaron Cicourel has discussed the survey method in terms of theory and practice in his Method and Measurement in Sociology. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

3. Ralph H. Turner, "Role Taking, Role Standpoint and Reference Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 1956, Vol. 61, pp. 316-328; Ralph H. Turner, "Role Taking: Process Versus Conformity," in Human Behavior and Social Process: An Interaction Approach. Arnold M. Rose (ed.), Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962, pp. 20-40; Tamotsu Shibutani, "Reference Groups and Social Control," in Human Behavior and Social Process, ibid, pp. 128-147.

4. Jacques Barzun, The American University, How It Runs, Where It Is Going. New York: Harper and Row, 1968, pp. 244-247. Barzun conceives the academic system in terms similar to these. He suggests that the "faculty, which is the university," is "community of learners" focused upon what the faculty write and teaches.

5. Everett Ladd and Seymour M. Lipset, The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics. New York: Norton, 1976, p. 4.

6. Don H. Zimmerman and Melvin Pollner, "The Everyday World as a Phenomenon," in Understanding Everyday Life. Jack D. Douglas (ed.). Chicago: Aldine, pp. 80-103.

7. Ladd and Lipset, "Intellectuality and Social Background: The Liberalism of Jewish Academics," ibid, Chapter 6.

8. Gerald Platt, Talcott Parsons, and Rita Kirschstein, "Undergraduate Teaching Environments: Normative Orientations to Teaching Among Faculty in the Higher Educational System," Sociological Inquiry, 1978, Vol. 48:1, in press.

9. The pocket dictionary on my desk to which I refer defines survey (n) as, "a general view or consideration," survey (v/t) "to take the general view of, to look at the whole." By contrast the same dictionary defines experiment (n) as a "test or observation for scientific purposes, under conditions controlled by the experimenter, to test or attempt to verify theory or discover new facts." See the Penguin English Dictionary, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1965. There have been occasions when the survey method has been used to test hypotheses but in general it has been used as suggested by the dictionary, to garner an overview.

10. Herbert Hyman, Survey Design and Analysis, op. cit.

11. Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study. (Mimeo) March, 1968.

12. Morton Bloomfield, "The Study of Language," Daedalus, Summer, 1973, pp. 5-13; William G. Moulton, "The Nature of Language," Daedalus, Summer, 1973, pp. 17-35; Yehashua Bar-Hillel, "Indexical Expressions," Mind, Vol. 63, 1954, pp. 359-379.

13. Before it appears that I would exonerate ethnography from all practical decision making in pursuing research, let me make it clear that this is merely a matter of quantitative difference between ethnography and survey research. Therefore, similar critiques could be made of the ethnographic method although, as already implied, the ethnographers' constructions would be less removed from the world of the respondents' practices.

14. Exceptions to this are some Marxist theoretical formulations, such as Alain Touraine, The American Academic System in American Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974; and portions of Jurgen Habermas's Strukturwandel de Oeffentlichkeit, Neuwied, 1962. Also see Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, The American University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

15. Parsons and Platt. ibid. Chapter 2.

16. Gerald Platt, Talcott Parsons, and Rita Kirshstein, "Faculty Teaching Goals, 1969-1973," Social Problems, Dec., 1976, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 298-307.

17. Gerald Platt, Talcott Parsons, and Rita Kirshstein, "Undergraduate Teaching Environments." op. cit.

18. Parsons made these same points many years ago in his presidential address to the American Sociological Association. He suggested: At the very least, then, general theory can provide a broadly orienting framework... It can also serve to codify, interrelate and make available a vast amount of empirical knowledge. It also serves to call attention to gaps in our knowledge, and to provide canons for criticism of theories and empirical generalizations. Finally, even if they cannot be systematically derived, it is indispensable to the systematic clarification of problems and the fruitful formulation of hypotheses. Talcott Parsons, "The Prospects of Sociological Theory," American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, 1950, pp. 3-16.

19. I would like to thank Rob Faulkner and Don Zimmerman for their helpful criticism.

CASE STUDIES OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

by

Robert T. Blackburn

Philip Altbach has captured very well the general state of affairs regarding the development and current status of research on faculty and the academic profession. It need not be either repeated or embellished by me. I would only append an experience of surprise I encountered while preparing these remarks. My index cards now contain about 2,500 entries of research on faculty, a collection I pride myself on as being reasonably inclusive of the best studies conducted on academics. Yet the number of studies which I extracted for this paper, and which are in the accompanying notes, totals less than 60. There are very few case studies focused on faculty. Furthermore, a high proportion of them are dissertations, documents which receive a limited distribution and, I suspect, an even smaller reading audience. I will speculate on the reasons for this draught in later paragraphs.

(As Altbach has demonstrated, the comparative literature also is limited. And Metzger will report few historical inquiries. The vast majority of the studies fall in the category of empirical investigations--surveys and, even more frequently, explorations of possible relations without theoretical underpinnings.)

Before displaying the contributions case studies have made to our understanding of faculty and suggesting what case studies need to be launched, a few remarks about the functions the case method provides are in order. On the positive side, most often the case approach is utilized to probe a problem to a depth surveys are unable to achieve. The case method is frequently adopted so as to ascertain key variables and to determine fruitful relations in a domain that is yet largely unexplored. When these are the goals, the case approach serves as a prelude to wider and more extensive inquiries. Frequently the case approach is short on theory. Mostly a hunch is pursued. Only rarely are hypotheses tested. The case method is often a quick in-and-out of a problem situation. Interviewing, small samples, and unsophisticated statistical analysis also characterize the

case approach.

On the negative side of the ledger, the case approach is costly. The price per datum can run very high when hour-long interviews are the elements for analysis. Sample sizes are small and the number of locations probed are few. Hence generalizing is severely restricted. In addition, almost never are cases replicated (nor are surveys, it should be noted) and hence reliability remains in doubt. An even more serious deficiency comes from the difficulties of controlling biases and from the absence of validation.

These advantages and disadvantages are well known, of course, and will receive no further attention here. Enumerating them, however, does help to account for the small number of such inquiries which reach the normal scholarly literature. The reports are awkward lengths--too long for journal articles (and lacking in generalizability) and too short for a substantive book. There are some notable exceptions, fortunately. Clark's Distinctive College and Riesman, Gusfield, and Gamson's studies of Monteith and Oakland are two.[1] They are, however, analyses of institutions, not on the academic profession except as the faculty is one set of players in the dramas.

Let us turn now to those aspects of faculty life to which case studies have contributed. We begin with some comprehensive efforts to encompass the full faculty role. These are followed by case studies directed at three common academic roles--teaching, research, and service. Then a set of cases which touch on personal dimensions--stress, personality, religion, and others--are presented. Next, cases exploring faculty relationships with significant others (students and administrators) are examined. The paper concludes with case studies dealing with three faculty issues--governance, academic freedom, and performance evaluation.

The Faculty Role

A. General

One foundation report, two dissertations, one article, and one unpublished report look at the multiple activities faculty engage in.[2] Morgan's interviews with Columbia University faculty epitomize the case technique at its very best. He utilizes role theory to suggest relationships and marshalls this soft data to confirm or reject outcomes. His conclusion that the most effective and satisfied faculty--variables which are not correlated

in almost every survey study--are those who have fully integrated the teaching and research dimensions. For these faculty there is no conflict. Just the opposite; the two are one.

This is a most important finding and one with significant consequences for those whose task it is to structure a work environment for academic people. The finding needs corroboration outside and beyond Columbia. It also needs to be known by more people than the author, his dissertation committee, and one or two others who happen to study academic people.

B. Teaching

While there are literally hundreds of articles and reports on student evaluation of teaching and their relationship to a host of factors (class size, grades, etc.), very few research pieces involve the faculty member as a person with ideas, feelings, and concerns around this central activity. There are more than the two reported here.[3] However, how professors deal with reports of their pedagogical efforts, what priorities they give to teaching, the desires and frustrations they have with respect to the teaching role, these and other central matters are yet to be studied. The case technique is ideally suited to probe these highly sensitive areas. That Pambookian learned that faculty who receive low ratings are essentially paralyzed from changing and that Meeker learned that receiving teaching awards alters the careers of some faculty only suggest that we know very little about a most important area, namely, teaching viewed from the professor's perspective.

C. Research

Survey studies have been excellent on this faculty role. Maybe because academics are clearly in agreement with regard to this activity there is little to be learned that questions accepted folklore--publish or perish, for example. At the same time, some case studies dealing with research and career patterns, mobility, promotion, and attitudes raise some interesting questions and provide some important clues for allowing faculty to realize their full potential.[4] For example, Raymond's intensive study of economists has considerable implications for the early career stages of an academic person. The importance and timing of that first article is critical for what will become total career production as well as rate of production over time. A supportive environment for the new faculty recruit will have a long run payoff for the individual and the institution. Surveys, as cross-

sections of a population, cannot uncover what an intensive examination of longitudinal data can reveal.

D. Service

Setting aside internal service to the university--governance, if you will (see below)--consulting is the principal activity in the service role. Yet this aspect of faculty life remains taboo. One dissertation, based on survey data, is the only knowledge we have of the extent of this activity, the nature of those who engage in it, and how the activity correlates with teaching and research.[5] As important as Lanning's contribution is, our ignorance about this role remains enormous.

When is an honorarium not a fee? Do faculty have guilt feelings about taking money? There are many delicate questions which need answers here. Obviously confidentiality is involved. Addressing the consulting issue at depths only a case approach could achieve is very much needed.

Personal Dimensions

Not surprisingly, few studies have had academics submit themselves to tests touching fundamental personality characteristics.[6] Those that do exist, however, are almost exclusively in the category of case studies. The willingness of faculty to participate is contingent upon establishing an intimate relationship with the investigator and gaining confidence and trust in that individual, a set of circumstances the case technique makes possible. Two such studies involve rather small numbers of academics but have been able to uncover some important findings.[7] For example, Sherman and Blackburn found a very high relationship between basic personality traits and students' judgments of teaching effectiveness. While it is not unexpected to demonstrate that the effective teacher has also to be an effective person, when one recognizes that the characteristics that an individual would have to change in order to increase her or his student rating are essentially unalterable ones--short of extended psychotherapy--serious questions about faculty improvement programs can be raised. (Gouldner's classic study of Antioch faculty is another case in point.)[8]

A. Openness to change

Despite a series of negative findings, the belief persists that some faculty are innovators, risk-takers, persons receptive

to new ideas, whereas other faculty possess the opposite characteristics. Yet sex, rank, discipline, organizational structure, role preference, liberalness, and a host of other factors fail to correlate with adopters of innovations in academic settings. Only age does (the younger are more likely to be adopters), but even here in the survey studies the statistical significance is marginal ($p = .04$). The reasons for the failure of these studies to find evidence to confirm accepted beliefs are not known. However, what is suggested is that the processes involved are much more complex than first meet the eye. That is, most investigators are asking the wrong questions. What is needed are some investigations which explore more of the dimensions of the acceptance or rejection of a proposed change. (The notes cite three case inquiries which have penetrated faculty behavior in the innovative process.)[9] More studies need to be launched in this area for clearly the ability to change is essential for survival, individually and institutionally.

B. Stress and Health

Relatively few inquiries have dealt with what is inevitably to become an increasingly common phenomenon, the physical and mental health consequences of stress.[10] As more and more individuals seek fewer and fewer places, pressures to succeed will increase, not diminish. All of us witness the tension in the new assistant professor today. He or she knows there is no second chance, not even the opportunity to launch a career in a less competitive institution. While the numbers are small, a national health unit has noted a large increase in breakdowns, especially among those faculty in their thirties.

While we need information on a broad scale so as to comprehend the magnitude of the problem, detailed work in selected environments also needs to begin. What kinds of structures and procedures can mitigate the tensions created by career uncertainty? For example, can mentors or faculty ombudspersons serve as effective outlets for distraught faculty? What are some more effective ways to deal with failure--the rejection of an article, for example. The number of issues here are many. We are clearly dealing with individuals at the core of their existence. Even with the implications on being able to generalize, case studies are desperately needed, as are competent personnel for conducting them. (Two studies touch on some career dimensions but do not directly deal with stress and health.)[11]

C. Non-Work Time

In contrast to most other occupations, academics fail to draw a very clear boundary between work and play, or leisure, if you will.[12] The professor is always at work, and never at work. Free thought time and free reading time are often job related. The 60-hour week is not complained about by academics, except to express concern that there was not enough time to accomplish the goals set by the self and by the college. Work and non-work are one for academic people.

Until recently I have thought this distinctive characteristic of the profession was one of its greatest virtues, and in many ways I still do. But the health findings just reported cause me to pause and reflect on other ways intense desires to learn and to achieve can be handled.

French and his colleagues interviewed spouses, but essentially for the purposes of corroborating the professor's reported use of personal time. (Their study included physical health measures.) A similar case study could expand this approach by ascertaining more directly how non-work time is related to tension relief. Gerstl's comparison of academics with advertising executives also could be expanded along these same lines, for presumably that occupation also attracts and selects people with strong internal drives.

D. Religion

As with the case of the research role, several excellent survey studies have been conducted on the religious origin of academics, their nonrandom distribution by discipline and institutional type, apostasy, and a number of other variables. Academics from Catholic and Jewish families have received special attention as under- and over-represented groups within colleges and universities. What well-conducted cases contribute above and beyond the survey findings are insights into the reasons for the observed correlations.[13] From the cases we learn that it is the cultural and socialization aspects of a faith that matter, not the ritual and symbolism of the religion. From the cases we can infer the values that are inculcated and which set career goals, that the high apostasy (more than 50 percent for all three faiths in research universities) will have very different consequences for the Catholic than it will for both the Jew and the Protestant, and that in many cases the professor's academic discipline and/or college has become the new religion. These are most helpful contributions for an understanding of the whole person qua professor.

E. Developmental

Sanford and two of his students have extended the concepts he developed for studying students and have adapted them for understanding faculty behavior.[14] Their reported findings come from extended interviews with a small number of faculty at a couple of institutions. Much more needs to be done in this area and their preliminary explorations are a good start. As yet, however, conceptualization is in its formative stages and we are still groping for the more fruitful questions which need to be asked.

"Developmental" is an "in" word today, but hopefully it will gain respectability before the fad passes and higher education changes bandwagons. In a larger perspective, it is longitudinal data that we need. Efforts need to be made to link such inquiries to the research that gerontologists have been and are conducting. Questions regarding career stages need to be explored within the particular context of the academic life span. For example, retirement is quite a different phenomenon for the professor than it is for the business executive. The academic becomes emeritus and can continue a productive career; the executive more frequently suffers a sharp discontinuity. But academics who are exclusively teachers and not scholars as well must also make major adjustments when they are removed from the nourishment that students provide. This example is only one of many that well designed case investigations need to explore to fill in the too large void that now exists with regard to career development.

F. Sex, Race, and Ethnicity

Through goodwill and legal pressures, higher education has invited females, blacks, chicanos, and others from underrepresented groups to join the academic profession. So far some inroads have been made but by no means has anything resembling success been achieved. In this area we have almost no research by any methodology. (We do not, however, suffer from a lack of rhetoric on the topic.) Many important questions are raised about those who have been excluded on the basis of nonsignificant characteristics and almost all await answers.

Furthermore, entry into the system is by no means a guarantee of success. Being a token in any group is fraught with dangers. The token in a department is bound to suffer isolation just at that career stage when the need for colleagueship is most vital

I will not belabor this important problem. I simply cite

one case study that documents some of the horror stories one hears in this domain.[15] We need to learn more.

Faculty and Significant Others

Faculty interact with numerous constituencies, of course, but illustrations here are confined to case studies dealing with students and administrators.

A. Students

Surveys have produced appreciable data on faculty opinions of students, student attitudes about faculty, and both student and faculty beliefs about a number of issues which affect them both--regulations, curriculum requirements, and decision-making, by way of illustration. But the questionnaire approach is not well suited to deal with interactions between the two groups. It is through the interactions that faculty behavior is revealed and inferences about expressed attitudes and actual actions can be drawn. Five case studies serve as illustrations.[16]

For example, Gamson learned in her Monteith study that actual closeness between student and professor is quite different in the social sciences than it is in the natural sciences. What faculty desire and what emotional commitments different academics make differ appreciably across these disciplines. Kagan learned that similar discrepancies between faculty expectations and student desires are most important in the doctoral process.

Returning to the undergraduate level, Raffel's findings on the consequences of Columbia College faculty's grading practices would only have surfaced through a case investigation. Similarly, Francis needed access to environments that questionnaires cannot penetrate. Last, by intervening in an extended legislative process, Blackburn and Lindquist learned that faculty can vote one way when students are present and the roll call is a show of hands and just the opposite a few weeks later when the voting procedure is by secret ballot. Here behaviors revealed basic attitudes that produced evidence contrary to that obtained by verbal expression.

B. Administrators

Like the surveys done with faculty and students on attitudes

and beliefs, there exists an appreciable number of--but not as many--reports comparing and contrasting faculty and administrators. Many of these studies focus on power, on who has influence in decision making. Such inquiries touch on conflict, on who has and who should have authority. But large-scale surveys seldom can focus on a genuine issue that affected the participants in reality and not just intellectually. Since the latter can yield clues regarding academic people, it is in this domain of conflict, power, and influence that case studies make their greatest contribution.

Some studies have concentrated on a critical process or a single event.[17] Others have looked at unionization and collective bargaining, manifest cases of conflict and power.[18] Two have looked at leadership within and between faculty and administration when faced with decisions to be made in both the day-to-day operation of a university as well as in crisis situations.[19] While the cases just cited leave many gaps in our understanding of faculty behavior vis-a-vis administrators, they do shed appreciable light on the typical faculty distrust of administrations (even of their professorial colleague of yesterday whom they themselves selected to be the Dean), the apparent schizoid attitude toward committees (detesting the time wasted in serving on them and simultaneously refusing to turn administrative tasks over to administrators), and the need to erect a barrier between themselves and other administrators in a "collegial" setting.

Three Issues

A. Governance

The last section on faculty/administrator relationships touched on governance. This section cites seven excellent case studies specifically focused on the decision-making issue.[20] Dykes' exploration and Baldridge's dissertation on NYU have received wide circulation and demonstrate the kind of contribution a case study can make. (The other analyses are equally good but--with the exception of Denenfeld--have not received equivalent visibility.) These cases have revealed that the locus of power is not necessarily where it exists on the organizational chart, that reason and goodwill are poor substitutes for political savvy, and that faculty who play the governance game are a special breed. Such findings are not particularly startling to those who are on the inside and experienced in the process. They do, however, reveal a dimension of some academics quite foreign to the popular image.

B. Academic Freedom

This issue is as extraordinarily difficult to investigate, by any method, as it is important. It was basic to the Lazarsfeld and Thielens' study that opened this symposium. Metzger is studying it historically and perhaps this is the best mode. While the AAUP records contain anything but a random sample of academics, in the same way that much of our understanding of human anatomy has been gained from studies of malfunctioning organs, so can we learn about faculty from atypical cases.

Academic freedom is an academic's central value. More than any other facet, the concept of academic freedom binds a large (600,000) and diverse body of professionals together. Academic freedom is always under attack in some locale, and almost nationwide today--albeit indirectly--through efforts to scuttle the practice of tenure.[21]

So we need to know more, continuously.

C. Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Probably no issue is as sensitive to faculty today as is the one involving judgments made about them by different constituences. With career opportunities severely curtailed, decisions affecting continued employment, promotion, and tenure are debated at great length. Who is competent to judge? What constitutes evidence? Faculty have invoked violations of academic freedom and gone to the courts to seek reversals of adverse decisions. California has enacted a law requiring written peer evaluations, a practice most faculty resist with great effectiveness. Florida requires student evaluations of teaching for promotions to be considered.

Case studies can help here, investigations which can work with small faculty units and which can sort out the critical relationships. Four cases conducted in four different settings at different points of time help some.[22] These studies obtained similar findings, namely, that a quite high degree of agreement exists between students and peers in judging a professor's overall teaching effectiveness; a somewhat lower (.40 vs. .70) degree of agreement exists between administrators and faculty and between administrators and students; but an essentially complete absence of agreement exists between the professor's self image and each of the three constituencies. (The last two relationships were investigated only in the Choy and in the Blackburn and Clark studies.) This last-mentioned finding, especially if generally true, is at the nub of the matter. If the individual and all others are in disagreement about the quality of performance, not

only does turmoil and conflict follow but also there is little chance for future constructive action.

Other matters in the evaluation process need immediate attention. Formal evaluations can be predicted to become a part of institutional procedure. The problems they cause need resolution. Well-conducted inquiries can inform us about faculty values. When my career is on the line, so is my entire selfhood. My professorship is my identity. Nothing matters more.

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, Burton Clark, The Distinctive College. Chicago: Aldine, 1970, and David Riesman, Joseph Gusfield, and Zelda Gamson, Academic Values and Mass Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

2. Lucile A. Allen and Robert L. Sutherland, Role Conflicts and Congruences Experienced by New Faculty Members as They Enter the Culture of a College Community. Austin, Texas: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1973; James H. Huber, "The Occupational Roles of College Professor," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1970; R.H. Morgan, "The Conflict Between Teaching and Research in the Academic Role," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970; Robert T. Blackburn, "Games Faculty Play: The Role of the Abrogationist," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 6 (Winter, 1973), pp. 103-114; Charles K. Warriner and Linda D. Murai, "Factors in Faculty Role Performance: An Examination of the Latent Role Hypothesis," University of Kansas, mimeo, n.d.

3. Two illustrations are Hagop S. Pambookian, "Initial Level of Student Evaluation of Instruction as a Source of Influence on Instructor Change after Feedback," Journal of Educational Psychology, 56 (1974), pp. 52-56; and John C. Meeker, "A Study of the Impacts of Selected Faculty Development Programs," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977.

4. Jerral C. Raymond, "Publications, Production of Knowledge, and Career Patterns of American Economists," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1967; E.F. Cammack, "A Study of Factors Related to Mobility and Faculty Productivity and Achievement at Michigan State University: A Follow-up Study," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965; Douglas Cantrell, "The Scholarly Productivity of Faculty as a Function of Their Promotion and Their Age," unpublished paper, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, 1967; David E. Kapen and Norman Wexler, "Faculty Attitude Toward Research in an Emergent College," Journal of Experimental Education, 38 (Spring, 1970), pp. 44-47.

5. While no case studies exist, there is now a first study available from survey analysis. See Alan W. Lanning,

"Correlates of Faculty Consultants and an Analysis of the Cosmopolitan-Local Construct," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977.

6. Richard H. Davis, "Personnel and Organizational Variables Related to the Adoption of Educational Innovations in a Liberal Arts College," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965.

7. Joseph L. Bishop, "The Relationship of Faculty Members' Perceived Sense of Security/Insecurity to Instructional Innovation in the Community College," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1970; Barbara R. Sherman and Robert T. Blackburn, "Personal Characteristics and Teaching Effectiveness of College Faculty," Journal of Educational Psychology 67 (1975), pp. 124-131.

8. Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles--1," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (December, 1957), pp. 281-306; Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles--11," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1958), pp. 444-480.

9. Joseph R. Gusfield and David Riesman, "Faculty Culture and Academic Careers: Some Sources of Innovation in Higher Education," Sociology of Education, 37 (1964), pp. 281-305; Thomas F. Cottingim, "The Process of Change and Its Application to the Junior College: A Case Study of a Change Effort," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1970; Francis K. Shuptrine, "An Analysis of the Relationship between Role Commitment and Innovative Behavior," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1971; Leslie N. Purdy, "A Case Study of Acceptance and Rejection of Innovation by Faculty in a Community College," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.

10. George W. Brooks and Ernest F. Mueller, "Serum Urate Concentrations Among University Professors, Relation to Drive, Achievement, and Leadership," Journal of the American Medical Association, 195 (1966), pp. 415-418; William W. Barnard and Robert T. Blackburn, "Faculty Role Conflicts in a Rapidly Changing Environment," Research in Education, 7 (November, 1972), p. 77; Mary Jo Clark and Robert T. Blackburn, "Faculty Performance Under Stress," in Alan L. Sockloff (ed.), Faculty Effectiveness as Evaluated by Students. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1973.

11. Douglas T. Hall, "Identity Changes During the Transition from Student to Professor," School Review, 76 (December, 1968), pp. 445-469; George L.B. Pratt, "Flexibility of Personality as it Relates to the Hiring and Retention of Public Community College Faculty in New York State," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1966.

12. Joel Gerstl, "Leisure, Tasks, and Occupational Milieu," in Erwin Smigel (ed.), Work and Leisure. New Haven: College and University Press, 1963, pp. 146-147 and 156-158; John R.P. French, Jr., C. John Tupper, and Ernst F. Mueller, Work Load of University Professors. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1965.

13. Henry Cohen, "Jewish Life and Thought in an Academic Community: A Case Study of Town and Gown," American Jewish Archives, 14 (November, 1962), pp. 107-128; John D. Murray, "Catholic Academicians and the Intellectual Subsociety Hypothesis," Chapter 15 in Anderson and Murray, The Professors. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1971, pp. 247-263; Norman L. Friedman, "Jewish or Professorial Identity? The Priorization Process in Academic Situations," Sociological Analysis, 32 (Fall, 1971), pp. 149-157.

14. Nevitt Sanford, "Academic Culture and the Teacher's Development," Soundings. (Winter, 1971), pp. 357-371; J. Wesley Brown and Robert C. Shukraft, "Personal Development and Professional Practice in College and University Professors," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California, 1974.

15. For an illustration of a most insightful inquiry which has yet to see the light of day, see Martha S. White, "Conversations with Scholars: Interviews with the Members of the Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study, 1961-63," unpublished study, n.d.

16. Zelda F. Gamson, "Performance and Personalism in Student-Faculty Relations," Sociology of Education, 41 (Fall, 1967), pp. 279-301; David Kagan, "Role Expectations of Doctoral Candidates and Their Faculty Sponsors," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966; Stan Raffel, "The Punishment of Intellectual Commitment: Some Effects of Columbia College on Its Students," The Human Factor, 8 (Spring, 1969), pp. 58-75; John Bruce Francis, "Student-Teacher Perceptions of College Classroom Decision-Making: A Study of Effects on Educational Outcomes," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969; Robert T. Blackburn and John D. Lindquist, "Faculty Be-

havior in the Legislative Process: Professorial Attitudes vs. Behavior Concerning the Inclusion of Students in Academic Decision-Making," Sociology of Education, 44 (Fall, 1971), pp. 398-421.

17. Robert R. Hind, Jr., "Evaluation and Authority in a University Faculty," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1969; J. Stam and J.V. Baldridge, "The Dynamics of Conflict on Campus: A Study of the Stanford April Third Movement," Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1971.

18. Robert E. Lane, "Faculty Unionism in a California State College: A Comparative Analysis of Union Members and Non-Members," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967; Donald Bylsma, Jr., and Robert T. Blackburn, "Some Consequences of Collective Negotiations in Higher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 54 (October, 1972), p. 130.

19. Floyd I. Wyrick, "The Effect of Departmental Leadership on Faculty Satisfaction and Departmental Effectiveness in a Big Ten University," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1972; John D. Lindquist and Robert T. Blackburn, "Middlegrove: The Locus of Campus Power at a State University," AAUP Bulletin, 6 (December, 1974), pp. 367-378.

20. Pauline F. Hunter, "Exploratory Case Study of the Formal Role of the Faculty in Educational Policy Making," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1963; Philip Denefeld, "Western Michigan University: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University: The Faculty Senate," AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1966, pp. 390-397; Joseph B. Cook, "Faculty Influences in the Decision-Making Process of the Multi-Purpose University," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1968; Archie R. Dykes, Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968; Kenneth P. Mortimer, "Academic Government at Berkeley: The Academic Senate," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969; Joseph V. Baldridge, Power and Conflict in the University: Theory and Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971; John D. Lindquist, "Political Life in the State University: A Systems and Community Power Analysis of a Faculty Senate, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972.

21. Lionel S. Lewis, "Faculty Support of Academic Freedom

and Self-Government," Social Problems, 13 (Spring, 1966), pp. 450-461; E.P. Tone, "A Study of Academic Tenure at the University of Washington," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1969.

22. A.H. Maslow and W. Zimmerman, "College Teaching Ability, Activity, and Personality," Journal of Educational Psychology, 47 (March, 1956), pp. 185-189; R.L. Isaacson, W.J. McKeachie, and J.E. Milholland, "Correlation of Teacher Personality Variables and Student Ratings," Journal of Educational Psychology, 54 (April, 1963), pp. 110-117; Chunghoon Choy, "The Relationship of College Teacher Effectiveness to Conceptual Systems Orientation and Perceptual Orientation," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1969; Robert T. Blackburn and Mary Jo Clark, "An Assessment of Faculty Performance: Some Correlates Between Administrator, Colleague, Student, and Self-Ratings," Sociology of Education, 48 (Spring, 1975), pp. 242-256.

STUDYING FACULTIES: THE HISTORIAN'S CONTRIBUTION

by

Walter P. Metzger

Until quite recently, the contributions of historians to the study of the academic profession could be described as massive in detail, rich in flavor, thin in concept, and bare of theory. As a rule, historians did not study academic faculties as such: they wrote histories of universities, histories of higher education, histories of academic freedom--and thus covered a good deal more; or they wrote biographies of important scholars and college presidents, accounts of dramatic academic incidents, colorful vignettes of campus life--and thus covered a good deal less. Generally, when they sought to organize their materials on a principle other than that of sheer chronology, they preferred the rubrics employed by historic actors (studium versus imperium and sacerdotium, secularism versus sectarianism, evolutionary science versus religious fundamentalism) to the conceptual schemes advanced by more contemporary social theorists (gemeinschaft versus gesellschaft, locals versus cosmopolitans, profession versus bureaucracy). And, for the most part, when they did treat collectivities of academics, they were not disposed to treat them statistically. A Morison discussing the Harvard faculty in the volume commemorating its tercentenary, a Curti and Carstensen elaborating on the history of departments at the University of Wisconsin, no less than a Rashdall writing about the consortio magistrorum in the Middle Ages, worked essentially with the mind-set of the belletrist: they sought to be strictly empirical, but they would not roughen the texture of their prose with tabular representations of career patterns, or replace corking good stories about professors with an index of academic professionalism, scaled according to six criteria, and applied to whole faculties at different points in time.

I, for one, would not belittle this historiography. Without it, we would not be able to trace professoriates to their guild beginnings, know the habitats in which they thrived and those in which they became an endangered species, capture the excitement and the monotony, the heroicalness and the cravenness, of being academic. As one who has contributed to this genre, I probably have a special reason not to apologize for it and to be glad that it shows no signs of perishing. Nevertheless, I do admit that its anecdotal and panoramic quality, its conceptual commonplaceness,

its arbitrary samplings, have limited its utility for the research now going on in this field. On any bibliography of the academic profession that includes, as major subtopics, the collective origins, social statuses, work patterns, remuneration, social roles of academic men and women, works by trained historians are conspicuous by their absence. The works that do appear on such lists are written by students of higher education, or by educational economists, or by sociologists of the professions, and these specialists, for all their prolificacy, do not fill the gap. Most of their works pay their ritual respects to history in an opening chapter; only a few -- Jencks and Riesman's Academic Revolution and Joseph Ben-David's The Scientist's Role in Society come to mind--add a temporal dimension that is intrinsic to the analysis and not just tacked on. On the whole, the sparse representation of historians has meant an insufficiency of history, so that it is almost correct to say that current research on the academic profession by non-historians has been research on current academic professionals, a monument to the living if not to the quick.

It is my happy duty to report that, of late, there have been stirrings in the discipline of history that promise to correct its chronic absenteeism. First of all, historians are displaying a new interest in the phenomenon of professionalism--in its evolving definition, in the timing of its emergence, in its impact on society. This new interest has already born multifarious fruit. It has produced new historical inquiries into both the nonacademic professions (civil and mechanical engineering, school teaching, medicine and the law[1]) and the academic professions (both the single profession-across-the-disciplines and the diverse professions-in-the discipline). Among the latter may be found studies addressed to a host of subject-matters, examined in a variety of times and places. Some historians have treated academic intelligentsias as distinctive entities with distinctive power drives and ideologies--Fritz Ringer's Decline of the German Mandarins and Sheldon Rothblatt's Revolution of the Dons are books in point. Some have pictured academics as part of a professional avant-garde that seeks to dominate modern society--Robert Wiebe's Search for Order and Burton J. Bledstein's The Culture of Professionalism stand out among American histories that advanced this theme. Quite a few historians have studied the norms of professionalized academics in the context of one or several academized professions -- here may be mentioned Mary Furner's Advocacy and Objectivity: Professionalization and the Social Sciences and Robert Church, "Economists as Experts: The Rise of an Academic Profession in the United States, 1870-1910" in Lawrence Stone, editor, The University in Society. And a number of historians have lately centered on academic professionals in moments of social crisis -- thus, George T. Blakely, Historians on the Homefront: American Propagandists for the Great War, and Carol S. Gruber, Mars and Minerva.

Though an exhaustive survey (which, manifestly, this is not) would reveal significant exceptions,[2] there is no doubt that the ebullient interest in professionalism exhibited by historians during the last ten years stems from their desire to prick its pretensions and unmask its selfishness, that a spirit of provocative iconoclasm runs through and unifies these assorted works. Accordingly, from these evidences alone, one would be hesitant to conclude that a new subfield of history is in the making. One might just as well conclude that one is witnessing a flurry that will subside once the idea of "profession" loses its discreditable connotations and ceases to inspire young historians to express their animuses through research.[3]

The works I have cited employ no innovative method But it is also a part of the glad new tidings -- in my view, it is the more telling part -- that historians in recent years have been reaching out to new methodologies as well. Here something more is afoot than the mere refinement of an old practique. As an illustrative case, consider the use by Professor Lawrence Stone of what he chooses to call "prosopography" (I will later suggest a less tooth-rattling name for this and similar methodologies). In The University in Society, a book that grew out of his seminar on the history of education at Princeton, Professor Stone contributes an essay on the size and composition of Oxonian student bodies that exemplifies the use of this technique. The conclusions of this essay need not detain us. But its modus operandi is portentous. By gathering statistical information about three centuries of college students, most of whom were unrenowned and therefore once deemed to be unknowable; by tapping a heretofore little-used mine of information--the Matriculation Registers of Oxford University; by using data on changes in student age, social backgrounds, careers as quantitative indicators of far-reaching changes in society, Stone enacts the reconciliation that is taking place between history and the social sciences. In my view, it is this scholarly rapprochement, much more than the current popularity of "professionalism" as a target of inquiry, that most strongly predicts an active future for historians working in this field.

Fully to grasp the importance of this rapprochement, one must be cognizant of the schism that preceded it. Needless to say, in this limited space, any foray into the changing relations between history and its sister disciplines would have to offer synopses and rush past nuances. Still, even a cursory account may place the new entente cordiale in perspective and thereby elucidate its likely consequences.

When one harks back to the period when history and the social sciences came of age (when history was converted from an amateur's

vocation into a professional occupation, and when sociology, political science and anthropology -- once rather dubious neologisms -- were organized into fullfledged disciplines), one cannot fail to be struck with how closely they were united in a cousinship of work and aims. In this period -- roughly the period between 1880 and 1914--the main rifts in the House of Learning ran horizontally between liberal and vocational objectives, general and specialized training, and not vertically between one social discipline and the rest. The founders of the profession of history in this country -- John W. Burgess, Herbert Baxter Adams, Henry Adams -- were ardent believers in the laws of history which they assumed a scientific approach to history would both verify and reveal. The leaders of the next generation of historians -- Frederick Jackson Turner and Charles A. Beard--though they rejected the causal interpretations of their masters, were just as committed to the notion that history transpired lawfully and that it was possible to delineate the conditions--the existence of a moving frontier, the persistence of animosities based on class--under which events occurred and re-occurred. Generally influenced by evolutionary biologists and the prestigious accomplishments of physicists and chemists, these historians drew their immediate inspiration from the works of eminent social theorists--Condorcet, Comte, and Tocqueville in the earlier period; Marx and Engels, Herbert Spencer, and E.B. Tylor in the later period--seminal thinkers who supplied the intellectual capital on which the emergent social sciences were to draw. (Freud, Weber, and Durkheim were to add much to that fund, but not while historians were so disposed to draw upon it.)

It is easy to see why historians in this formative period found the masterworks of social science useful and absorbing. For one thing, these works were really histories, albeit of that particularly majestic kind known as histories of civilization; for another thing, though they sometimes used an invented terminology, they did not use an esoteric methodology, and so could be weighed and criticized by persons with general academic backgrounds; for still another thing, they relied on evidences they found rather than on evidences they generated, and thus confirmed the worth and reliability of records that happened to survive. If, on top of these compatibilities, they provided historians with general historic laws, of the sort that assisted them in their quest for scientific respectability, the profit gained from intercourse was deemed to be all the greater still.[4]

Exactly when this closeness departed is not an easy thing to determine. If one believes that the expansion of the several disciplines inevitably turned them into occupations too large, too busy, too specialized to stay in touch, then one might locate the climax of separation at some point - possibly the early 1920's -

along their respective curves of growth. But if one is inclined as I am--to stress deeper cultural factors, to believe that the parting of the ways reflected a cleavage in basic values, then one would emerge with a somewhat different calendar. Without denying that sheer number made communion difficult, I would hold that it was the erosion of confidence in the social order, which in turn destroyed confidence in the science--or even in the existence--of an ordered past that broke the bonds of interdiscipline; my inclination, then, would be to date the disjuncture some time after the onset of the Great Depression and the rise of totalitarian threats. For me, the symbolic end of the integrated era came when Charles A. Beard, in his presidential address to the American Historical Association in 1933, called upon historians to cast off their "servitude to the assumption of natural science" (he also meant social science) which he now saw had always been a snare and a delusion. Not only did Beard renounce the old Ranckean notion of writing history wie es eigentlich gewesen (by showing how meagre was written history compared with the amplitude of historic records, and how meagre were historic records compared with what had actually taken place); not only did he recant his own monocausal histories (by acknowledging that his economic interpretation had understated the independent efficacy of political and military factors); he also rejected the possibility of writing objective history (by asserting that every act of thought emerged from a social context and was for that reason biased and incomplete).[5] It is instructive to note that the first major assault on value-free historical scholarship in America did not occur when Staughton Lynd and other New Left historians discovered the so-called consensual school of Hartz and Boorstin, but when Charles A. Beard, a liberal historian, discovered Croce and Mannheim. Whether in good logic or not, the general effect of this relativist perspective was to convince historians of their specialness, to persuade them (to the extent that they needed to be persuaded) of the unique discreteness of their subject-matter and the inescapable subjectivity of their accounts.

Meanwhile, as historians abandoned what they came to conceive as a naive scientism, social scientists in America were turning away from what they came to regard as an overblown historicism. Their response to the crisis of the modern age was to renounce theories of civilizational development (which had carried intimations of unerring progress) in favor of social theories of a more modest range that would allow them to state and operationalize hypotheses, test them with quantitative data, and (in time) feed the factual harvest to machines. Whether this was an evasive response to anxiety (people are known to submerge themselves in busy work to escape their problems), I am not prepared to say. It may be that it was a typically American response, that there was something peculiarly American about the conversion of the

study of mind into the science of psychological testing, the transformation of European wissenssoziologie into survey research on public opinion. In any event, there was a turn, less abrupt and less total than I have indicated, from the study of macrocosmic changes to the study of microcosmic processes; from reliance on historical, recorded evidence to reliance on contemporary, often freshly-gotten evidence; from concern with quala to concern with quanta, and to the use of statistical modes.

It is also clear--and this goes to the heart of the new division--that these two cognitive styles did not develop entirely from within, but were in nourishing and protective alliance with the outer world. Disciplines are not only formalized ways of thinking; they are also producers and vendors of products that appeal to different sectors of the social market. In their new identity, the social sciences in America found a ready market for their products among the managers of work-forces, the planners of military battles, and the seekers of solutions to social ills. This is not to say that they assumed their new identity in order to sell their works. The world of sales and solicitation did not invent the public opinion poll: Lord Bryce conceived of it for heuristic purposes long before B.B.D. and O. adopted it for theirs.

Before World War One, psychologists developed aptitude, intelligence, and projective tests for clinical diagnostic purposes; it was only during that war that these were made to serve a conscript screening function, and it was only after that war that they came to serve a vocational sorting function. Nor is this to say that social scientists became the servants of men in power. One may vote on this issue as one pleases, but in doing so one should not forget that the conclusions of survey research were often critical of American society (cf., e.g., the work by Samuel Stouffer on civil liberties) and that quite a few social scientists working for the state at war (e.g., the personality-in-culture anthropologists working for the OWI during World War Two) were at odds with important features of official policy. But it does not seem overharsh to conclude that a statistically-oriented, theoretically-modest social science flourished when it caught the wealthy fancy of the commerical, administrative, and philanthropic worlds.[6]

And history? I believe it, too, formed a fit with the surrounding culture, but with a different part of the culture--with the part that took positive pleasure in the failure of the Gallup poll to predict the 1948 election, with the part that wrote plays like Desk Set asserting that computers could never ape the human mind, with the part that nodded in agreement when the poet Auden wrote a new commandment:

Thou shalt not sit with statisticians
Or commit a social science

Again, this is not to say that historians formed their attitudes at the bidding of those who bought their books. There was a real, not contrived affinity between the belief that history dealt with unique events and the belief endorsed by religious publics that human beings possess free wills, between the view that each historian sees the past from his own perspective, and the view of humanists and artists that creative insight yields the highest truth. Indeed, one could detect an anti-determinist, pro-voluntaristic strain in history even in its scientific heyday. A hundred years ago, the historian Goldwin Smith, attacking the Comtean positivists, had stoutly declared that he would "continue to believe that humanity advanced by free effort, that it is not developed by invariable laws, such as, when discovered, will give birth to a new science." What Smith said then was not very different from what the historian, Sir Isaiah Berlin, said a century later when he attacked the logical positivists: Human beings, he insisted, are not "bodies in space, obeying causal laws, but... active beings, willing, creating, pursuing ends, shaping their own and others lives."[7] The difference was that the early statement was a desperate rear-guard action mounted against the major tendency of the discipline, whereas when Berlin spoke, historians, looking back, were perceiving their dalliance with the social sciences as a youthful but happily outgrown indiscretion. And in this view they were supported not just by conventional minds and a defensive clergy, but by many sensitive spirits who recoiled from the dehumanizations of technology and the homicidal uses of scientific gains.

Out of this disjunction, with its public backings, there arose in the field of history a strong ideology--primitive no doubt, but still compelling--that attributed separation to innate differences. We are we and they are they (so it was believed and at times openly contended), not by virtue of external circumstances, but by virtue of how we think and what we think about. THEY (the social sciences) aspire to be nomothetic, to find regularities in human conduct that can be stated in the form of general causal laws; WE (the practitioners of history) are ideographic or descriptive, since we deal with societies in their inimitable gestalts, personalities in their uncompromising specialness. Further, THEY deal with things that can be measured and tend to ignore things that cannot; WE know that we cannot achieve and should not try to effect a statistical manner of expression, primarily because we handle subtle qualities--passions, sympathies, values--that elude the crudities of a count. Not invariably, but not seldom either, those who described history as a different discipline went on to praise it as a nobler discipline. History, they would claim,

takes a vow to art as well as to truth; its aim is to excite aesthetic pleasure through the past relived and superbly rendered; to this end, it employs a language that is rich in evocative ambiguities. The social sciences, on the other hand, do not live in this state of stylistic grace; seeking the vigor of the physical sciences; they try at all costs to be unequivocal and wind up being jargonish and pedestrian. To such historians, the argument of the disciplinary segregationists did not even contain the softening addendum offered by racial segregationists - "separate yes, but also equal."

So much for the break; the time has come to speak of reconciliation. During the last two decades, and more markedly over the last ten years, there have appeared unmistakable signs of closer contact and communication between these disciplines. I speak of "signs" to suggest that, despite the appearance of the Journal of Social Science History, the Journal of Interdisciplinary History, and other such Capulet-Montagu publications, despite the growth of the so-called "new" political history, "new" economic history, and particularly "new" social history; despite the increase in the number of professors on interdepartmental appointment who would once have been considered double agents and are now considered connecting links, the contemporary rapprochement has been rather spotty. And I speak of "contacts" and "communication," rather than of "re-integration," in order to suggest that, despite the increased volume of give-and-take, history and social science have not fully composed their differences. It should be borne in mind that, while some philosophers may argue that historians necessarily classify events and deal with causes, any historian who wishes to protect the claim of his metier to a distinctive subject-matter can find plenty of philosophical ammunition in a Collingwood to use against a Hempel or a Nagel.[8] It should be remembered, too, that disciplines continue to be sub-cultures, with roots that run deep and stretch far out, and not mere administrative categories, which can be fused to fit a master chart. Finally, it should be understood that, in their institutional settings, disciplines have practical reasons for not abandoning a special gnostic role. A history department that admitted to offering undistinctive wares would not strengthen its hold on the next year's budget. Provosts and deans are not likely to be moved toward generosity by a parody of Descartes' argument: not "cogito, ergo sum," but "sum, ergo cogito"--here we are, must we also demonstrate that we think?

Nevertheless, something of great importance has been happening, and it has been happening at the cross-points where the self-definitions of historians intersect with the opportunities of craft.

A few years ago, the Marxist historian, Eugene Genovese, in discussing the tendency of American historians to study the slave from the viewpoint of the master, commented in the New York Review that "writing the history of a nation without considering the vicissitudes of a majority of its people is not a serious undertaking." It did not take a left-wing conscience to perceive this, though the radical historians of our day have taken particular pains to point it out. Many historians, of various persuasions, had long bemoaned the squint of history toward the upper classes and its consequent engagement with quite small numbers. But up to recently, the prevailing view had been that a lack of documentary evidence - letters, diaries, official statements - made it difficult, and often impossible, to write much about ordinary people. The adage, "no evidence, no history," had generally been taken to mean "no literary remains, no history" and so the vast majority of mankind had been consigned by their lack of writing skills to a dim penumbra or to oblivion. It was only when this fatalism was largely banished--when it became known that men who do not leave written records may yet leave visible traces--that the preoccupation of historians with tiny leaderships became a defect not to be endured. Of course, historians had looked into voting records, membership lists, army records, and other trace collections before. What I am referring to here is something "more" rather than something altogether "new" -- the awakening of historians to the vastness and variety of trace repositories and their realization that men in the mass can be remembered far more adequately than had usually been supposed.

In creating this new awareness of extant resources, the work of historical demographers has been particularly important. In the early 1960's, the Cambridge Group for the Study of the History of Population, following the lead of French demographers, began systematically to exploit the English parish registers -- records that stretched back to the early sixteenth century. These church records contain the date of a communicant's baptism, marriage, burial; they sometimes furnish information -- titles like "mister," "sir" and "worthy" that can place the individual in a status hierarchy; occasionally, they include references to spinsterhood, bachelorhood, illegitimacy. Just for the statistical light they shed on births and deaths and marriages, data which can then be used for the computation of rates of fertility, mortality, and nuptuality, these pre-census records would be invaluable. But they have the added virtue -- as do all of the most hueristic trace collections -- of recording the names of individuals, as well as the vital facts. The nominative character of these materials allows the historian to reconstruct the genealogy of families -- not just of notable families, whose trees might have been deliberately preserved in any case, but of ordinary families

whose lineage would have been unknown to posterity but for the existence of an archive created with other ends in view. The historian may rummage through these genealogies for lively stories or -- and this has become a widely adopted protocol -- he may deal with these evidences collectively, and thereby calculate the long-term changes in the average size of families, the average spacings of birth, the average age of marriage. Handling trace materials of this sort presents the historians with all sorts of technical difficulties; often the work can be frustrating, time-consuming, richer in promise than fulfillment. But it does serve to counterbalance the elitism of documental history with significant facts about the heretofore obscure dead.[9]

And what a cornucopia of traces has been uncovered, once the word got out and the hunt was on: In American history, almost every sub-specialty has been re-invigorated by this evidentiary quest. American colonial historians, going to land records, church records, tax records, probate court records, are redefining the history of early towns and pre-industrial families.[10] American historians interested in social mobility are making use of nineteenth century city directories and federal and state manuscript censuses to track the movement of immigrants and natives, whites and blacks, up and down the occupational scale.[11] American political historians are exploiting the computerized files of election returns to develop a new kind of grass-roots political history - one more concerned with electorates than leaderships, more with the popular symbology of party preferences than with the high policies of state.[12] Students of American business history are finding a gold-mine of traces in the Dun and Bradstreet records, kept intact since 1850, which shed light on the personal affairs as well as the business affairs, the profligacies as well as the profits, of thousands of American merchants catalogued by name. In that collection alone lies enough material to make a civil libertarian shudder and send a social historian into paroxysms of delight.[13]

It would be going too far to say that the gathering abundance of these materials is the only factor responsible for new alliances. But it may not be exaggeration to say that it is the single most important factor. First of all, because trace materials are often fragmentary, ambiguous, or unwieldy, historians must stretch their ingenuity to deal with them. Often this leads to a systematic manipulation of the data, a working out of the logic of inquiry, an explication of taxonomies and rubrics, that have been more common to the method-minded social sciences than to the discursive style of history. Second, trace analysis tends to encourage quantitative treatment. Not only are trace materials voluminous and thus susceptible to numerical pre-

sentation; they are often so voluminous that they must be sampled and sometimes so multiplex that they can be used to produce correlations and covariances. It becomes difficult to maintain a principled objection to statistics in the face of this much need and opportunity, and the historian's fear of reductionism, if it does not vanish, tends to recede before the requirements of the work at hand. Third, trace materials and trace analysis tend to encourage the use of explanations that go beyond the historian's stock-in-trade. To accumulate details on kinship in colonial Andover but to refuse to consult the theories of kinship current in sociology and anthropology would be to display an incontinent love of facts and a curious distaste for explanation. Most often, the process of fact-finding and ratiocination goes the other way: the historian reads Parsons and Murdoch to get a sense of what to cull from the mountain of traces stored in Andover, and he plots a critique of their ideas (sometimes, by standing on their shoulders, he espies a better one) before he undertakes his research. The sequence of thought is not important: what matters is that the historian who deals with traces feels a special compulsion to work conceptually, and that this too tends to banish insularity. "Neither a borrower or a lender be" comes to be seen as self-defeating doctrine when one is rich in demographic facts concerning massive populations, but poor in organizing principles, frameworks of understanding, and potent questions to be asked.

For all this, it would be unsound prophecy to suppose that history will be devoured by the social sciences. At the least, each will retain its own research objectives. Historians will still seek to know what has happened in particular times-and-spaces; for help, they will call on the products of the social sciences. Social scientists will still desire to construct general propositions about human behavior; as tests or proofs of these propositions, they will draw on the happenings of history. Historians, insofar as they continue to capture contexts, will doubtless continue to write about matters they cannot measure and prefer a language that is moving and somewhat ambiguous to one that is gracelessly exact. Most, I daresay, will choose neither to join the artists in heaven nor the social scientists on earth below, but to find a lodging-place in between - one might call that destination purgatory were it not for the excellent chance that they will possess, not lose, both worlds.

I return to the symptomatic importance of Lawrence Stone's resort to the Matriculation Registers at Oxford, a device that allowed him to lift the shroud of anonymity that had covered generations of undergraduates. From what has been said, it should be clear that this contrivance may be regarded as a happy strike, but cannot be regarded as an eccentricity. It is a specimen of

a procedure whose time has come, and it is also a harbinger of works that will be forthcoming. Nor are the studies that it represents and foretells likely to confine themselves to students. Faculty members as a class may leave more literary documents to posterity than do many other classes, but there still lies within this group a rank-and-file that is as silent as any peasantry. And if the democratic urges of the "bottom-up" historian do not work to exhume this buried lumpen professoriate, the desire of the interdisciplinary historian to fill the cells of conceptual schemes will surely do so. It is a safe bet that a "new" history of the academic profession, founded like all the other "new" histories on trace analysis, is about to emerge.

There will be no want of exploitable trace collections for such a history. A recent article by Robert McCaughey, which tracks the development of a professionalized faculty at Harvard during the nineteenth century, and a shorter article by William D. Carrell, which examines the social backgrounds and occupational commitments of American professors during the latter half of the eighteenth century, point to the usefulness of one set of faculty records - those compiled by the institution of their affiliation.[14] McCaughey's detailed account of the transformation of the Harvard faculty, drawn largely from the university archives, attests to the richness of these sources, but his concentration on a single (and clearly, atypical) institution raises questions of representativeness that his data cannot resolve. But one may also turn, for more comprehensive information, to the United States Bureau of the Census, whose statistical series on academic teachers dates back to 1840, and to the United States Office of Education, whose earliest compilations start in 1870, when the United States Commissioner of Education began to publish annual reports based on institutional surveys. That these historical statistics also have their limitations hardly needs to be underscored for any historian who has consulted them, or indeed for any historian aware of the limitations of all trace collections. Their virtues are that they are comprehensive, that they are easily accessible, and that they are gathered with an abundance that reflects the nation's consuming interest in education. Their liabilities are that they are predigested (that is, abstracted from the tally-sheets and summarized), anomymous (bare numbers are hermitic givens, names precipitate more research), and classified under inconstant rubrics (thus, it was not until as late as the 1950's that the part-time academic teacher was given a separate category). Some of these defects can be rectified retrospectively - and should be, with all the federal subsidy that it may take to do it; others, apparently, must be lived with, as one must with an illness contracted in one's thoughtless youth. Still another type of trace collection can be found in the historical files of monitorial organizations -- the

American Civil Liberties Union, the American Association of University Professors, the diverse disciplinary societies--that deal with professorial complaints. Potentially, these files are of a richness unapproached by statistical compilations, since they are likely to contain not just a series of discrete markings, but a sequence of interactions -- an initial statement of grievance (accompanied perhaps by a useful array of autobiographical information), a response by a defending party (an academic administration, say, or perhaps a governmental agency), and interpolations from a secondary cast of characters (which may grow as the plot begins to thicken and the scope of investigation begins to spread). Rather than simply treat these cases as so many dramatic stories, the "new" historian is likely to treat them as a group whose contents may be sampled, then transferred to a questionnaire, and then prepared for quantitative analysis. It should come as no surprise that these materials are also hard to handle. The researcher will discover that many things he would like to know -- the complainant's religion, for example -- are lost beyond recovery because they were not of interest to the gatherer. If he deals with cases over an extended time-period, he will find that comparisons between the sample and the universe must be made in synchronous terms and that this cannot always be smoothly managed. But historical case records offer benefits that may outweigh these costs, including their freedom from reactive influences that bias responses to direct surveys, and their capacity to recognize academics who passed through this vale of tears and left no other conspicuous momento.

Only the future can disclose how the history of the academic profession (here and elsewhere) will be rewritten under the impetus of trace analysis. But it may take less than clairvoyance to surmise how the research interests of historians will be shaped. They will probably develop a consuming interest in the historical demography of the profession -- in its race, age, and gender profiles, its places of origin and destination, its absolute and relative population sizes, as these change over lengthy spans of time. They will probably probe more deeply into the historical economy of the profession -- its sources and levels of income, its general and local standards of living, its rates of promotion and retirement, again with an eye to long-term change. They may, if the evidence permits, pay closer attention to changes in the work-life of the faculty -- to its peer and authority relationships, its methods of resolving conflict, its inner morale and sense of worth -- and they may look afresh at faculty-student contacts, measuring the degree of homophyly, or the extent to which (at different times) like taught like. For help in explaining what trace abundance permits them to describe, they will surely make use of the analyses of demographers, economists, and sociologists; but just as surely they will not use them

slavishly. They will find that, for some of their problems, there is no answering consensus among the social sciences, and that for others, the conceptual spadework has not yet been done. Even in the era of interdiscipline, they will be required to use their own powers of insight and imagination to perfect their work.

FOOTNOTES

1. Some studies of the non-academic professions do touch on the academic training of practitioners and on the mentality and activity of members stationed in the professional schools of universities. In part, then, they belong on the reading-list of new works on the academic profession. Cf. Daniel H. Calhoun, American Civil Engineers: Origin and Conflict (1960); Monte A. Calvert, The Mechanical Engineer in America, 1830-1910: Professional Cultures in Conflict (1967); William R. Johnson, "Education and Professional Life Styles: Law and Medicine in the Nineteenth Century" History of Education Quarterly (Summer, 1974) 14:185-207; Gerald Markowitz and David Rosner, "Doctors in Crisis: A Study of the Use of Medical Education Reform to Establish Modern Professional Elitism in Medicine" American Quarterly (March 1973) 25:83-107; Jerold S. Auerbach, Unequal Justice: Lawyers and Social Change in America (1976).

2. Among the works that might be labelled "pro" profession, and they are not innumerable, one would include Harold Perkin, Key Profession: The History of the Association of University Teachers (1969) and W.J. Reader, The Rise of Professional Classes in Nineteenth-Century England (1966).

3. Cf. Walter P. Metzger, "What is a Profession?" Program of General and Continuing Education in the Humanities, Seminar Reports, volume 3 (1975).

4. One would not deny, even then, that the seams between the disciplines were showing. Even then, for all their interest in social laws, historians were being tugged toward the particular: thus, the seminar of Herbert Baxter Adams at Johns Hopkins, while it purported to trace American democracy back to Teutonic germs, actually produced highly descriptive histories, and the nine-volume history of Jefferson and Adams, the magnum opus of Henry Adams, did not once mention the second law of thermodynamics or the rule of phase. Even then, historians seemed to shy away from rigor in the definition of terms: Turner's use of the word "frontier" had more of a poetic than a scientific cast to it. Moreover, there could already be detected in sociology, especially in the American practice of it, a shift from concern with temporal sequences to a concern with timeless social processes (thus, Cooley's universal "looking-glass self" and Giddings' universal "consciousness of kind") and also to a concern with contemporary social problems (thus, E.A. Ross's efforts in

behalf of immigration restriction and R.E. Parks' consideration of ethnic conflict in Chicago). Nevertheless, after these and other signs of divergence are noted, there remains the appearance and reality of a remarkably undivided world. History and political science were in close rapport: the slogan "history is past politics and politics present history" was one indication of it; the fact that Woodrow Wilson and Charles A. Beard did notable work in history while holding chairs in political science was another; when Burgess placed the Department of History in the Columbia Faculty of Political Science, he was not aiming at an artificial interdiscipline but was giving recognition to an accomplished fact. History and economics were no less linked: the translation of the work of the Italian economist, Achille Loria, was an event eagerly awaited by historians (Turner may have picked up his frontier hypothesis from that source); the economist E.R.A. Seligman wrote an interpretation of history with the same assurance with which he wrote about finance. And then there is the mesh to end all meshes: Herbert Baxter Adams, surrounded by his Johns Hopkins wunderkinder, undertaking to teach one of them (Veblen) economics, another (Albion Small) sociology, another (Arthur Bentley) political science, and yet another (Turner) history. It took a very small graduate school to make this Leonardo effort possible; but it took faith in the connectedness of learning to bring it off.

5. Charles A. Beard, "Written History as an Act of Faith" American Historical Review (January 1933), 39:219-227; see also, Beard, "That Noble Dream" American Historical Review (January 1935), 41:85-87.

6. The willingness of Americans to entrust their social problems, even those that had agelessly defied solution, to the saving competences of the quantitative social sciences is illustrated by the intellectual history of Theodore Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality. Cf. Martin Jay, The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research (1973).

7. Sir Isaiah Berlin, "The Concept of Scientific History" History and Theory (1960), 1:1-31.

8. Cf. R.C. Collingwood, Idea of History (1956); Carl Hempel, "The Function of General Laws in History" in P. Gardner, Theories of History (1939); Ernest Nagel, Structure of Science (1961).

9. Cf. E.A. Wrigley, Population and History (1969).

10. Cf. John Demos, A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony (1970); Kenneth Lockridge, "The Population of Dedham, Massachusetts, 1636-1736" Economic History Review (August 1966), 19:318-343; Philip J. Greven, Four Generations: Population, Land and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts (1970). This and the next two footnotes are meant to be no more than suggestive cullings from vast and constantly growing bodies of work.

11. Cf. Stephen Thernstrom, The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis (1973).

12. Cf. Paul Kleppner, Cross of Culture: A Social Analysis of Midwestern Politics 1850-1900 (1970); Lee Benson, The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy (1961).

13. Cf. Peter R. Decker, "San Francisco Merchants, 1850-1880" (Columbia University, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1973).

14. Robert A. McCaughey, "The Transformation of American Academic Life: Harvard University, 1812-1892," Perspectives in American History (1974), 8:239-332; William D. Carrell, "American College Professors: 1750-1800," History of Education Quarterly (Fall 1968), 8, 289-305. Also, a dissertation in progress, Alan Creutz, "From College Teacher to University Scholar: The Evolution and Professionalization of Academia at the University of Michigan, 1850-1900".

THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION: NEW DIRECTIONS OF RESEARCH

by

Burton R. Clark

There are currently two forms of imbalance in the literature on the academic profession. One is over-concentration on the United States; the second is the distortion of views from the top. From recent historical and comparative analysis, we can specify several perspectives that will lead to corrective directions of effort. Three points quickly summarize what I have in mind.

1) National academic structures dictate the nature of the academic profession. The academic profession differs considerably among countries, in such important aspects as the distribution of power, the selection of personnel, the means of career advancement, and the extent to which practice is guided by universalistic or particularistic criteria. In some national systems that have been traditionally rooted in "chair" organization, considerable personal authority has accrued to individual professors, and collegial authority to small clusters of them, with a strict hierarchy within the teaching and research domain of a given discipline at a given university in a form that can be likened to the traditional dominance of the master over journeyman and apprentices in the guilds with which the western university began in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. Guild forms have been amazingly persistent, even within national unitary and ostensibly bureaucratic systems, amounting in practice to a bargain whereby a central ministerial staff paid attention to a national allocation of funds and some common rule-making about curriculum and personnel across the system, while operational power within the understructure remained firmly in the hands of autocrats and clusters thereof. Within this long-worked-out bargain, the selection and advancement of junior personnel remained firmly in the hands of the local barons. With this, "professional association" within the discipline often became heavily localized: young persons took their academic clues from the home shop and not from the membership of the discipline stretching across the nation and into international circles. In contrast, in some other countries, especially in those where the chair was long ago superseded by the department as the basic operating unit, the personal and collegial forms have been dampened, especially the personal, as those forms became more thoroughly mixed and intertwined with bureaucratic administration at the campus level,

and with, in many cases, some form of lay supervision. This mixture has been beneficial for universalistic judgment, since operational sites have been less monopolized by one group and thereby more exposed to multi-group surveillance. This tends to reduce the amount of roguish behavior within the academic profession.

In short: if we wish to know about the nature of the academic profession in various countries, we must analyze the nature of the basic academic roles in the national systems and especially their effects on career lines, associational ties, and universalistic judgment.

It is also the case that national academic structures vary greatly in the extent to which they allow for inter-institutional competition. The most powerful hypothesis available in comparative higher education since the early 1960's is the one preferred by Joseph Ben-David and Abraham Zloczower, namely, that the more competitive national systems are the ones that remain more productive in science in the long run. The competitive systems free younger academics to move to locations advantageous for the pursuit of their own ideas and research; they allow institutions to bargain for the services of such promising scholars. In contrast, the non-competitive systems have not allowed institutions to amass differential rewards and have interposed many kinds of roadblocks to a competitive flow of academic talent. In sum: weak administrative linkage among universities and colleges within larger systems apparently enhances the research productivity of those in the academic profession. Surely this hypothesis is worth much more extensive investigation than it has thus far received in research, particularly as we in the United States move from market conditions in higher education toward state and national arrangements of administered order.

2) Expansion diversifies the academic profession. The shift from elite to mass higher education in one country after another means that the academic labor force shifts from elite to mass characteristics. By traditional standards, this shift amounts to a deprofessionalization of a good share of the labor force, moving professors toward the job conditions and the status of secondary school teaching. Whether we speak of the growing diversity within the academic labor force as deprofessionalization or as a multiplication of academic professions, it is the case that expansion is accompanied by greater specialization and greater division of labor. One simple indicator is the great range among institutions in teaching loads, and the related division of time between teaching and research. The teaching-load range in American higher education is from zero to 18 and 20 hours a week. There is often considerable variation within given institutions; e.g., four hours a week in the

natural sciences, six hours in the social sciences, and nine hours in the humanities, with the latter sometimes stretching to twelve hours. A more systematic form of variation is among institutional sectors, as between the light teaching loads of research universities, the modestly heavy loads, averaging nine hours, in the better liberal arts colleges, and the twelve to eighteen hour loads that one can find in numerous third-level universities, state colleges, and community colleges.

Hence, we can no longer say that U.S. professors teach and do research. This is pure academic ideology, a myth, that is allowable in the hands of practitioners, for its uses in legitimation and interest-group advancement, but not at the hands of researchers who are attempting to determine the truth of what constitutes reality. Most American academics no longer do research, a trend that has been in progress for a long time and which has simply been accelerated by expansion, as such sectors as the community colleges and state colleges have picked up the heavier parts of the teaching burdens of mass higher education. As individuals in those institutions have lost the individual visibility that comes from published research, and at the same time, have been absorbed into ever-larger local and state bureaucratic frameworks, there has been a considerable growth of feelings of deprivation and powerlessness which has helped to fuel the move of academic personnel into academic unions.

There are now such clear and obvious facts about these matters available in recent national surveys that it becomes inexcusable for researchers to go on holding to a view which suggests directly or indirectly that the only academic action worth studying is that which goes on in the top fifty research universities. Since researchers are in the leading research universities, they have to be on guard against adopting a view from the top, one that may lead to progress in the sociology of science, but surely retards progress in the sociology of higher education. The view from the top causes many observers of the American scene, including leading sociologists, to lag about twenty years behind the changing realities.

3) The fragmentation and integration of the academic profession have now become key research problems. The academic profession has always been a holding company of sorts, a secondary profession, composed of persons from diverse fields who have their primary identifications, loyalties, and statuses within their disciplines. A good test of this point is whether one is willing to pay annual dues first to the American Associations of University Professors (or counterpart units) or instead first pay dues to the major association in one's own discipline. We surely know the answer, even before putting the question into a national survey.

But it would be useful to know the variation in commitment of academics to their disciplines and the profession at large, across the major sectors of institutions that now represent major points of fracture. The rewards as well as the tasks of academic work simply vary greatly among the sectors, as, at the extremes, between the role of the sociology professor in an urban community college, with a teaching load of 15 to 18 hours and an unselected student body, many of whom read at the 8th or 9th grade level or lower, and, in contrast, the sociology professor at Harvard.

In short, the academic profession contains increasingly strong forces of fragmentation, as among institutional sectors as well as among the diversity of disciplines. The sector differentiation fragments individual disciplines. It is unclear what this means for the future of disciplinary associations, other than a growing strain of attempting to accommodate to the interests of a more heterogeneous membership rooted in diverse academic roles. At a minimum, such associations themselves are likely to become more like holding companies, loose federations that group together people of different primary commitments.

The directions of effort suggested by these three points are heavily structural in nature, pointing always to basic academic structure, from primary operating roles to the largest sets of connections that constitute a national system. This general approach amounts to a bet that the best predictions of the behavior of academics as professional people will not come from the study of their social background, or from knowing their identification with large political ideologies, but from analysis of the primary roles that they take up in the academic structure. The limited amount of cross-national research done to date suggests that this is a good bet for research in other countries as well as in the United States, despite the fact that in most other societies we encounter stronger social-class identifications and political affiliations than we find among American academics. We certainly need to get away from the kind of study of academic attitudes and values that leave these phenomena floating in the air, or else assigns them in aggregate fashion to the whole academic profession, without close specification that links them to differentiated roles. For some time to come we need to study the academic profession by paying serious attention to the growing division of labor in academic society.

The University of Michigan, as an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer, complies with applicable federal and state laws prohibiting discrimination, including Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. It is the policy of The University of Michigan that no person, on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, marital status, handicap, or Vietnam-Era Veteran status, shall be discriminated against in employment, educational programs and activities, or admissions. Inquiries or complaints may be addressed to the University's Director of Affirmative Action, Title IX and Section 504 Compliance, 5072 Administration Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109. (313) 763-0235.